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Abstract

Migration is the movement of people from one location to another and widely associated with the change of permanent place of residence. It commonly takes place because of push factor or less opportunities in the socio economic situation and also because of the pull factors that exist in more developed areas. This mobility of man has favorably or adversely influenced not only the socioeconomic condition of the area as well but also influenced the socioeconomic condition of human life. In India, unsustainable rural livelihoods are the main reason of migration to urban areas. But those who migrate from their native place in search of better livelihood are living well below the acceptable standards. Poor housing condition, health afflictions, unhygienic living condition are some of the terrible state that the migrant workers have to face.

Aligarh city is very much facing a renowned face in lock industry and in other unorganized sectors like construction and meat factories. They catch both short and long distance migrants. The present study tries to analyze the socio economic status of these migrant workers. The prime objective of the study is to examine the socio economic condition and also the causes and consequences of migration. The study is based on the primary sources of data. A total of 150 migrant workers have been interviewed by using a well structured questionnaire. The study confirms that although there is an improved income level, the living condition for most of the workers is deplorable as most of them live in poor rented houses without proper provision of hygiene and sanitation.
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Introduction

Migration is the geographic movement of people across specified boundary for the purpose of establishing a new permanent or semi permanent residence. Human migration is one of the most important aspects of social sciences. Migration is the barometer of changing socio-economic and political condition at the national and international levels. It is also a sign of wide disparities in economic and social conditions between the origin and destination (UNFPA 1993). Uneven distribution of resources and population, unbalanced utilization of resources and variation in economic and cultural development has influenced the mobility of man from one region to another (1). In the developing country like India, masses of the poor, landless, illiterate and unskilled agricultural laborers and petty farmers from backward state migrate towards big metropolises. Such massive rural to metropolitan migration of distressed people is a typical characteristic of migration in India (2). (92) Most of the out-migration of male population to other states occurs in states like Bihar, Jharkhand and West Bengal and the states like Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Karnataka experienced more number of in-migration mostly because of higher job opportunities, high daily wages, better quality of life and other economic and social reasons. This mobility of man has favorably or adversely influenced not only the socioeconomic condition of the area as well but also influenced the socioeconomic condition of human life (1). The migration aspects and socioeconomic condition of slum in Hyderabad found that migrants are settled there for generation and having bad socio-economic condition and have come to this particular area because of cheap accommodation. The majority of the migrant workers working under the unhygienic conditions and these migrants prefer to live collectively by taking a room/house and share the rent (3), an analysis of migrants workers in Punjab found that 20 percent migrants workers are not in a position to pay rent of a room and they are bound to live under sheds, open spaces or in go downs, this clearly depicts their miserable condition of living, and economic factor is the real serious matter of concern for them (4). The study of migrant
construction workers revealed that rural migrants are predominantly young people who migrate due to poverty, face poor living and working conditions and lacks of education and skills. They remain excluded from public services, protection and opportunities for advancement in a growing economy [9]. Found in their study of Kangra district that since migration most of the migrant workers have improved their conditions and also have increased in their income levels but the majority of people socio-economic condition did not improve substantially as majority of them still live in poor living conditions [7]. In the study of Kerela, poor economic conditions along with other overlapping factors have been identified as the main reason of migration. Higher wages and availability of work are reported as the reason to migration. Despite the improved income level they are still living in poor living condition and for most of them is deplorable as they have to live together sharing with others having no provision to hygienic sanitation. The present study tries to analyze the socio economic status of these migrant workers of the Aligarh city. The present study try to highlight the issues of small cities workers as most of the previous studies based on the issues of the workers of the metropolitan cities. The prime focus of the study is the socio economic condition of the workers especially who are engaged in lock industry, construction industry and meat factory and also the causes and consequences of migration.

**Objective of the study**
1. The main and prime objective of the study is to examine the demographic characteristics and socio-economic condition of the migrant workers.
2. To find out the main reason behind their migration.
3. To give study based suggestion for the betterment of the migrant workers.

**Study area**
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The present study is conducted in Aligarh city which is Class I city (Greater than 1,00,000 population) as of the census 2011 of India, population of Aligarh district is 3,673,889. Aligarh is the important business center of Uttar Pradesh. It is located at 27°4’ East Longitude and 27°53’ N Latitude, about 133 km away from the country’s capital, New Delhi on the main railway route of Kolkata to Delhi, in the western part of the state Uttar Pradesh. The city covers an area of 36.7 sq km and subdivided into 70 wards (census 2011). The percentage share of urban population in the district is 33.1% as against 22.3% of population in urban areas of the State (Census 2011). According to Census of India 1991, total population of Aligarh city was 4,80,520. There was an increase of 27.16 per cent from 1971 to 1981, 49.75 per cent from 1981 to 1991, 38.96 per cent from 1991-2001 and 164.64 percent from 1971 to 2001. Now the Aligarh urban agglomeration has population of 909,559 and Aligarh Municipal Corporation covers a population of 872,575 (Census 2011). The population of Aligarh city getting almost doubled every twelve years or roughly 6 per cent growth rate of population is observed of this 2 per cent is in time with the average growth rate of population and rest 4 per cent are migrants from the villages. As now nearly 36000 people are added annually to the population. Aligarh is known as “Tala Nagri”. Locks and Hardware industries are the main industries of Aligarh. Among all the industries, lock industries are dominating; other industries are Hind Agro (Slaughter House), Glaxo (pharmaceutical), and
Bricks Kilns around the city. These industries attract a large number of both skilled and unskilled workers from the surrounding areas of the district and other districts of U.P, even also from other states of India.

Data base and methodology
The present study is based on the both primary and secondary sources of data. Primary data is collected from the field survey. Survey has been carried out in the month of April to June 2017 with the help of well structured questionnaire and all the data regarding the socio economic condition of migrant workers was collected. Each respondent employed in lock factory, slaughter industry and working at construction sites is personally interviewed by researcher. A total of 150 respondents working in these three sectors were selected randomly i.e 50 respondent from each prominent sectors of employment. The secondary data mostly regarding the details of Aligarh city was collected from different government sources- District census handbook Aligarh 2011, Aligarh Municipal Corporation 2010, District Statistical handbook, and from magazines, research journals, published and unpublished works. The data collected were organized, tabulated, and the results were analyzed with the help of statistical techniques. The analysis carried out in the study is descriptive in nature. The socio economic condition of the migrants such as state of origin, causes of migration, demographic characteristics and living condition has been explained through simple percentage method. The results of the study have been better represented through tables and charts.

Results and Discussion
The socio-economic condition of the migrant families is one of the important aspects that need to be focused. Most of the studies find that the low economic condition of the family is one of the major factors responsible for large scale migration. The study also tries to examine whether these migrants were now more satisfied from their living or they face the same or different situations in their migrated work places regarding living and socio economic status. This section discusses the demographic profile and socio-economic condition of migrant workers, their state of origin, types of works, living conditions.

Table 1: State-wise origin of the migrants

| States migrated from | No. of respondents (n) | Percent (n=150) |
|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Bihar                | 83                     | 55.3            |
| Uttar Pradesh        | 42                     | 28.0            |
| West Bengal          | 18                     | 12.0            |
| Other                | 9                      | 4.7             |
| Total                | 150                    | 100             |

Source: Field survey (April to June 2017)

The above table (1) shows the states from where the migrant workers migrate to Aligarh city for getting work and employment. It is clear from the table that most of them belong to Bihar state (83 percent) as Bihar State is one of the BIMARU states where poverty level is much high as compared to other states of the India, followed by the other districts of the state Uttar Pradesh (28 percent) most of them came from the nearby districts of the Aligarh city and also from the villages of the Aligarh District. Rest of the respondents comes from West Bengal (12 percent) and from other states also (4.7 percent).

Causes of migration

Table 2: Causes of Migration

| Causes of migration | No. of respondents (n) | Percent (n=150) |
|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Poverty             | 72                     | 48.0            |
| Unemployment        | 54                     | 36.0            |
| Low wages           | 18                     | 12.0            |
| Marriage            | 6                      | 4.0             |
| Total               | 150                    | 100             |

Source: Field survey (April to June) 2017

It is not very easy for anyone to leave their native places; there are several factors, sometimes it is social cause and sometimes it is economic causes that reinforced them to leave their original place. The study reveals that the major cause for migration of the worker as shown in the figure (2) was poverty (48 percent) next in the line was the unemployment (36 percent). Another reason to migrate was the low wages (12 percent) in different sectors of employment at their native or original place. While marriages (4 percent) was one of the major cause of migration for most of the women respondents is concerned. The above findings reveal that the desire to get better life and opportunities to have better life for their families is one of the foremost reason for any individual as well as migrants workers of the city to leave their origin places where their situations are not in their favor to fulfill their desires of better life.
The demographic characteristic of the respondent presented in the table 3, majority of the respondent were males (64 percent) and rest of the respondent were females (36 percent). Most of the respondents were in the most productive age group of 25-34 years (48 percent) and respondents (41 percent) were in the age group of above 35 as shown in the Figure (2). The age structure of the migrants workers of the represented streams of work (construction, lock and slaughter industry) make known that it needs hard works and lots of energy to work with therefore most of the workers are in the young and productive age group (76 percent of the total workers belong to 25 to 45 years) figure. It was also found that majority of them were married (64 percent) remaining were (36 percent) unmarried and single parents. It is clear that most of the respondent are belong to the young age group as all these occupations and works require monotonous work and they have to do hard work. Most of the female workers are working there and also work as house maids to support their families as most of them are married and they live with their families.

Table 3: Demographic characteristics of the respondents

| Gender      | No. of Respondent (n) | Percent (n=150) |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Male        | 96                    | 64              |
| Female      | 54                    | 36              |

| Marital status | No. of Respondent (n) | Percent (n=150) |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Married        | 96                    | 64              |
| Unmarried      | 47                    | 31.3            |
| Single parent  | 7                     | 4.7             |

| Age structure (years) | No. of Respondent (n) | Percent (n=150) |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| 15-24                 | 23                    | 15.3            |
| 25-34                 | 72                    | 48              |
| 35-44                 | 42                    | 28              |
| Above 45              | 13                    | 8.7             |
| Total                 | 150                   | 100             |

Source: Field survey (April to June) 2017

Table 4: Socio-economic conditions of the migrant workers

| Family Type            | No. of Respondent (n) | Percent (n=150) |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Joint Family           | 38                    | 25.33           |
| Nuclear Family         | 105                   | 70              |
| Single parent family   | 7                     | 4.66            |

| Education status       | No. of Respondent (n) | Percent (n=150) |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Primary                | 15                    | 10.00           |
| Middle                 | 14                    | 9.33            |
| High                   | 13                    | 8.67            |
| Intermediate           | 8                     | 5.33            |
| No Schooling           | 100                   | 66.67           |

| Monthly income         | No. of Respondent (n) | Percent (n=150) |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| <2000                  | 61                    | 41.0            |
| 2000-5000              | 68                    | 45.0            |
| >5000                  | 21                    | 14.0            |
| Total                  | 150                   | 100             |

Source: Field survey (April to June) 2017
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Fig 6: Level of education attended by migrant workers
The table (4) shows the socio-economic status of the migrants' workers and the results declare that regarding the family structure of the workers are belong to nuclear family (70 percent) and only 25.33 percent belong to the joint family followed by the single parent family with 4.66 percent. This representation of family structure (mostly nuclear family type) of the workers reveals the fact that they are migrated with their wives and children and settled there in search of better opportunities of life to be live with and they leave their parents and other members in their native places. The table clearly depicted that the situation is much more worsen regarding education status of the migrants as 66.67 percent of them were not seen school in their lifetime. Rest to them was doing primary level (10 percent) followed by middle, high school and intermediate with 9.33 percent, 8.67 percent and 5.33 percent respectively. Most of the females represented in the study as migrant workers were engaged in lock factory and also do some parts of residual work at their homes with respect to lock factory work and also engaged in construction industry work. The income status of the respondents also shows miserable situation where only 45 percent were earning between Rs 2000 to 5000/- per month and 41 percent were earning less than Rs 2000/- per month. The income status of the workers of the slaughter industry is quite reasonable as compared to the workers of the others two represented workers of the study. As per the daily wages of the construction workers they face miserable living condition as they get lowest income as compare to other workers (lock and meat factory) which are not enough for them to survive. Therefore their women also work with them as a worker to support their needs of daily living and to survive their families.

### Table 5: Living condition of the migrant workers

| Housing status     | No. of Respondent (n) | Percent (n=150) |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Rented             | 109                   | 72.7            |
| Own                | 41                    | 27.3            |

| Types of House          |                         |                 |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Pucca                   | 58                      | 38.7            |
| Semi-Pucca              | 84                      | 56.0            |
| Kuccha                  | 8                       | 5.3             |

| Drinking water source   |                         |                 |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Municipal/Community Tap | 122                     | 81.3            |
| Hand pump               | 17                      | 11.3            |
| Submersible             | 11                      | 7.3             |

| Toilet and bathroom facility |                         |                 |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Yes                          | 103                     | 68.7            |
| No                           | 47                      | 31.3            |
| If yes                       |                         |                 |
| Within premises              | 57                      | 55.3            |
| Outside premises             | 46                      | 44.7            |
| Total                        | 150                     | 100             |

Source: Field survey (April to June) 2017

The data collected on the living condition of the migrant workers reveals that though the income level of the respondents increases but the situation remain very much miserable as per the living condition is concerned. From the table (5) it is clear that respondents having ownership of house were only 27.3 percent where as majority of them lived in rented houses (72.7 percent). 56 percent of the respondents were lived in semi-pucca houses (56 percent) and remaining (38.7 percent, 5.3 percent) was living in pucca and kuccha houses respectively. Majority of the respondents gets water from the municipal or community tap (81.3 percent) and rest of them from hand pump (11.3 percent) and submersible (7.3 percent) respectively. Most of them are endowed with the facility of toilet and bathroom facility (68.7 percent) whereas 31.3 percent were not having this facility. In which 55.3 percent of them were having the facility of toilet and bathroom within their premises but 44.7 percent of the respondent having this facility outside their premises. The above scenario of the workers regarding their living conditions shows that they are come here to live better life but the fact is not like, they face miserable living condition in this place too but somewhat better than their native place or place of origin from which they come.

It is clear from the above discussion that no doubt there is increase in their income level but it is not enough for their survival to earn their basic needs. Economic condition is still the real matter of concerned for them. They are still lived in low standard living conditions as they are socio-economically poor. It is very difficult for them to get all the basic facilities of life for themselves and for their families.

### Conclusion and suggestions

After going through the whole process of analyzing the demographic and socio-economic conditions of the migrant workers of the Aligarh city, study concluded that the migrant workers for the search of employment to fulfill their basic needs of life, they were came not only from the nearby districts of state U.P but they also came from the other far off states of India. There are several reasons that enforced migration but the main cause of these migrant workers of the city is the poverty. Another cause for migration is unemployment and the low wages at their native places. Majority of the respondents are in the productive age group as these sectors of employment require monotonous work and they have to do lots of hard work. As far as the socio-economic condition of the migrants is concerned, it is very much poor and miserable. Their income status not supports them to earn their basic needs and to fulfill their daily livelihoods. Most of the respondents have never seen school in their lifetime; it means majority of them were illiterate. Those who attend school were only educated up to middle and primary school. Their education status also not supports them to do smart jobs and also work as a skilled job workers. The situation of the migrant is much more worsening as their living condition was devoid of hygienic living environment. Majority of them did not able to afford their own houses so they tend to prefer to live together in rented houses or rooms and share their rents. The migrant workers still facing serious challenges regarding their livelihoods as their economic condition not support them as much as they are needed.

### Suggestions

1. It is very much crucial that need to be focused more is the all round socio-economic development of all the parts of rural as well as small urban areas or towns such that to remove or reduce the extra burden on the big metropolises. This all will be helpful in checking distressed migration of rural young people to leave their native place.

2. There should be need to increase the frequency of programs for human resource development and to reduce or eliminate poverty. For this there is a need to
generate many employment opportunities both in agricultural and non-agriculture sectors in rural areas as well as in neglected small towns and cities.

3. There is a need to open cheap and useful skill development training programs affordable to all i.e every individual of the society have easy access to all these resources.

4. Another important demand from the Central Government or State government to check the rural-urban migration is that she should take initial steps by providing all the comfortable and basic infrastructure and amenities in rural areas. So the rural people might change their perception about the urban areas and prefer to stay in rural areas.

References
1. Ali AM, Toran K. Migration, Slums and Urban Squalor - A Case Study Of Gandhinagar Slum, Proceedings Of The Third International Conference On Environment And Health, Chennai, India, 2003, 1-10
2. Ashok S, Thomas NA. Study on issue of inter-state migrant labourers in India. International journal of scientific & engineering research, 2014; 5(7):91-94.
3. Census of India, 2011.
4. District Census Handbook Aligarh, 2011.
5. Mukherji S. Low Quality Migration in India: The Phenomena of Distressed Migration and Acute Urban Decay, proceedings of 24th IUSSP Conference, Salvador, Brazil, Session 80: Internal Migration-Social Processes and National Patterns, 2001.
6. Premchander S, Prameela V, Banu S, Meenakshi KG, Manjunath H, Prema T. The socio-economic status of migrant construction workers in Banglore and intervention plan to improve their livelihoods, Urban India, 2014, 34(1):112-133.
7. Saikia D. The Socio-economic Status of Migrant Workers in Thiruvananthapuram District of Kerala, India, Journal of Economic and Social Thought. 2016; 3(1):113-125
8. Sethi S, Ghuman RS, Ukpere WI. Socio-economic analysis of the migrant labourers in Punjab: An empirical analysis, African Journal of Business Management. 2010; 4(10):180-189.
9. Thakur V. A Study on the socio-economic profile of migrant labour in district Kangra (Himachal Pradesh), International journal of science and research. 2017; 6(8):1025-1030.