

AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS ON QUALITY OF LIFE OF MIGRANTS IN TIRUPUR CITY

*DR. P. AMBIGA DEVI, **DR. S GANDHIMATHI

**Professor of Economics, Avinashilingam University for Women, Coimbatore, 641 043,*

***Associate Professor, Avinashilingam University for Women, Coimbatore, 641 043 Tamil Nadu, India*

ABSTRACT

Migration is the movement of people from one place to another place, which could be voluntarily chosen to search for new and better opportunities or forced to escape negative or dangerous situation. There has been a steady increase in India in the number of migrants. In the year 1961 there were about 144 million migrants by place of birth and in 2001 it has increased to 307 million. Various reasons are attributed to the reasons on migration. The working and living conditions of the Migrants, who could easily be absorbed in informal activities in urban areas are far from satisfactory. The present study is an attempt to find out the reasons for migration and their living conditions. To carry out the study, 100 migrants in Tirupur city were selected at random and administering an interview schedule data for the study was collected during the month of November 2011. The current study exhibits that economic factors outweigh social factors for the people to migrate. It further corroborates the Todaro's model of migration which says that migration takes place because of differences in expected wage rates. The analysis reveals that the quality of life of the sample migrant households is far from satisfactory.

KEY WORDS: Migrants, Migration Pull Factors, Push Factors, Quality Of Life Index.

Migration is the movement of people from one place to another place. It can be voluntarily chosen to search for new and better opportunities or forced to escape negative or dangerous situation. For many people around the state moving away from their home town or village can be the best and in sometimes the only option open to improve their life chances. Migration can be hugely effective in improving the income, education and participation of individuals and families and enhancing their children's future prospects. A voluminous literature is available explaining migration that mirrors the discipline and ideological underpinning of the researches. Although sociologists like Lee (2003) conceptualized migration as the play of negative and positive factors that respectively pushes a migrant from the place of origin to migrate and pulls him to the place of destination, neo-classical constructs dominated the explanations. Locating migration decisions at the household level and arguing that such decisions are based on the opportunities and constraints that the households face, the neo-classical theorists propagated human capital theory (Todaro, 1976). This construct argued that the inclination to migrate is determined by the differences in income between source and destination of migration and may result

in equating expected income. Given their skills, their decisions about where to live are based on whether the individuals can optimize the present value of their discounted stream of expected future earnings. Migration according to Saxena R.P and Bedi, I.S (1966) may be motivated by the desire to seek skills that leads to development, urbanization and socio-economic transformation. In the same line Stark (1991), identifies transaction cost, imperfect information and imperfect credit, land and labour markets as the main determinants of migration. Barik, B.C (1994) models migration as an outcome of a joint utility maximization by the prospective migrant of the other family members. These elaborate models of behavioural decision making emphasize that circulation of labour as a form of risk reduction, a means of spreading the risk spatially and occupationally while maximizing consumption. Internal migration is an important source of socio-economic changes. There has been a steady increase in India in the number of migrants. In the year 1961 there were about 144 million migrants by place of birth and in 2001 it has increased to 307 million. Migrants from rural areas are usually illiterate or semi-literate and work in informal sector in cities, providing key

services that make life better for most of the city inhabitants (Seela.K.Prabhu, 2009). For most of the migrants working in the informal sector, the working conditions and the facilities provided at the sites are far from satisfactory. Apart from these, there is no recreational facilities, no availability of drinking water, toilets, canteens etc. Living conditions are in no way better than the working conditions. They are destined to live in slums where one does not get proper civic amenities. The surroundings are totally unhygienic. There are no proper facilities for drainage, toilet, potable water, electricity, recreation etc. There are no local medical facilities, hospital, school and fair price shop. They need to struggle to get ration cards. For all these reasons it is very difficult for them to maintain a healthy community life. The present study is an attempt to find out the reasons for migration and their living conditions.

To carry out the study, migrants in Tirupur city were selected. Tirupur was part of Coimbatore District till 2008. Since then it acquired the status of a separate district, with six sub divisions viz-Tirupur, Palladam, Avinashi, Udumalpet, Dharapuram and Kangeyam. The latest statistical data (2011) reveals that in Tirupur, there are about 4.5 lakh migrant workers. The studies on migrants in Tirupur city reveals that large migrant population live in the city of Tirupur have to face severe acute problems such as drinking water shortage, water pollution, bad roads and slums. In Tirupur city hosiery garments provide jobs to larger section of the people. As on 2002 there are about 6988 knitwear industry employing about 86,405 persons. To carry out the study a hosiery garment unit was approached. After getting prior approval from the management of the unit, the researcher approached the workers in the unit. The unit employs about 800 workers in all categories. From this, 100 migrant workers were selected at random and administering an interview schedule data for the study was collected during the month of November 2011.

Objectives of the study

- To analyse the reasons for migration
- To find out the living conditions of the migrants and
- To estimate the quality of life index of the migrants.

Results and Discussions

An analysis on the selected socio economic characteristics of the migrants reveal that about 20 percent of the migrants are in the age group of 20- 30 years, 60 percent in the age group of 30-50 years and the remaining above 50 years of age. The educational qualification reveals that 10 percent have completed only middle school, 40 percent high school and the remaining 50 percent higher secondary level of education. The monthly income wise data of the migrants reveal that 20 percent of the migrants have their monthly income less than Rs. 4000, for 15 percent in the range of Rs 4000-Rs 6000, for 50 percent in the range of Rs. 6000- Rs 8000 and 15 percent earn more than Rs. 10,000 per month. The average monthly income of the migrants is estimated to be Rs. 7,500. The per capita monthly income of the households of the migrants reveal that for 10 percent of the households, it is less than Rs. 2000, for 80 percent it is in the range of Rs. 2000- Rs. 4000, and for the remaining 10 percent it lies between Rs. 4000- Rs. 6000. The average percapita monthly income of the migrant households is calculated as Rs. 3,200.

An analysis was also made on the expenditure made by the migrant households. For 23 percent of the households, the monthly expenditure is less than Rs. 2000, for 60 percent of the households it is in the range of Rs. 2000- Rs. 3000 and for the remaining 27 percent it lies between Rs. 3000-Rs. 4000. The average percapita monthly expenditure of the households is Rs. 2450.

REASONS FOR MIGRATION

Some specific reasons exist that attract people to migrate from one place to another for the purpose of living in there; such movements are caused by pull and push factors. The following table reveals the number of migrants who assign first, second and third ranks to the selected pull and push factors for migration.

For 50 percent of the migrants, 'family contracts' is the major pull factor for their out-migration. They assign 1st rank to this factor. Second rank for this pull factor was assigned by 35 percent of the migrants. None of the migrants assign 1st rank to 'other social contracts'. For 'favourable employment' 55 percent assigned first rank and 30 second rank. 'Other social contacts' does not seem to be

TABLE I
RANK ASSIGNED FOR PUSH AND PULL FACTORS

Factors	Rank Reasons	I	II	III	Not stated
		N	N	N	N
Pull factors	Family contracts	50	35	15	0
	Favourable employment	30	55	15	0
	Other social contacts	8	17	75	0
Push factors	Family movement	50	23	27	0
	Poverty & Low income	70	25	5	0
	Mechanization of agriculture	15	10	15	60
	Social tension	20	15	10	55
	Loss of land	2	6	5	87
	Natural calamities	2	5	10	83
	Marriage	3	7	10	80

Source: Primary data, 2011. N - Number stated.

a major pull factor for the migrants. Only 8 percent of the migrants assigned first rank to this factor.

Among the push factors it was 'poverty and low level of income' which pushed the migrants away from their places of origin to migrate. This factor was assigned first rank by 70 percent of the migrants. Next to this, 'family movement' was another push factor for 50 percent of the migrants, who assigned first rank. The other factors such as 'mechanisation of agriculture', 'social tension', 'loss of land', 'natural calamity' and 'marriage' were not cited as the major factors for migration.

BASIC AMENITIES

One of the problems that migrants usually face is finding suitable shelter in the place of destination. All the migrants live in rented houses. The details on the structure of the house reveal that all live in houses constructed with bricks, with cement flooring and with asbestos roof. But the number of rooms in each house differs. While 50 percent of households have three rooms in their houses, 30 percent have four rooms and 20 percent live in five-room rented

houses. The house rent varies from Rs. 700 to Rs. 1200 per month for three room houses and from Rs. 1200 to Rs. 1500 per month for four room houses and from Rs 1500 to 1800 per month for five room houses. All the houses have electricity connection. In their rented houses 30 percent of the households have drinking water taps within the house and 70 percent outside the compound. Similarly, while 20 percent have bath rooms with in the house, 80 percent have outside the house but with in the compound. Only in 10 percent of the houses latrines are constructed with in the house and in the remaining houses latrines are constructed with in the compound but outside their houses. All the houses have closed drainage.

MEASUREMENT OF QUALITY OF LIFE

The Government of India, in collaboration with the UNDP split out in the urban poverty removal strategy that poverty has a social dimension-viz-poor quality of housing and the living environment and lack of access to basic services, clean water, education etc. and that measurement of poverty needs multi-dimensional norms. For a developing economy, it is necessary to develop a multi-dimensional poverty line instead of poverty line based on

calorie intake of food primarily which is only a starvation line. Based on the work of Dhanasekaran, Quality of life index was constructed with a set of 7 quantitative and qualitative indicators representing the social and nutritional status and the type of house in which the migrants live. Human poverty relates to deprivation in education. The Eleventh Plan states that "Education is the most critical input for empowering people with skills and knowledge and for giving them access to productive employment in the future". Income status, which is determined by the occupation structure, throws light on the poverty status of any area. Per capita income is one of the determining factors of poverty. There is an inverse

relationship between per capita income and poverty. The consumption pattern of the households also reveals the economic conditions in proportion of their expenditure towards food. Clothing is one of the basic needs next to food. Clothing requirements of children, men and women necessitate different norms for clothing. In the estimates prepared by Guru Swamy (2006), the clothing requirements have been calculated as Rs 207 per person per annum or Rs 17 per month. Housing is the third basic requirement of mankind next to food and clothing. Shelter is very much related to improving the quality of life. Non-availability of shelter affects the quality of life. Based on these quality of life index table was constructed assigning

TABLE 2
QUALITY OF LIFE INDEX

Indicator/scale	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Education	Illiterate	Primary (class I to v)	Middle (class vi to viii)	High school (class ix to x)	Higher secondary (class xi to xii)	Under graduate, Diploma	Post graduate and others
Occupation of the head of the household	Casual workers and / or less than 100 days employed in a year	Agricultural / non agricultural labour households (regular workers in an organised sectors)	Marginal farmers (less than 1.25 acre)	Small farmers (1.26 to 2.50 acres)	Medium farmers (2.51 to 5.00 acres)	Large farmers (5.01 to 10 acres), self-employment in non-agriculture (exceeding rural artisans)	Government service
Monthly per capita income (Rs)	< 750	500-750	751-1000	1001-1250	1251-2000	2001-4000	Above 4000
Percentage expenditure on food	80 and above	75-79	70-74	55-73	60-64	45-59	< 45
Annual expenditure on clothing (Rs)	=119	120-179	180-239	240-299	300-359	360-639	640 and above
Type of house							
Roof	Leaf	Tiles	Tiles	Tiles	Tiles	Tiles/pucca	Terrace
Wall	Mud	Mud	Bricks	Brick	Leaf	Brick	Brick
Floor	Mud	Mud	Mud	Cement	Cement	Cement	Cement
No of rooms per person	0	.25	.5	1	1.25	1.5	> 1.5

Source: Table constructed

scores ranging from 0 to 6. The following table 2 gives the Quality of Life Index Table. Using this, a household is assumed to be extremely poor, if the average quality of life

index score is less than 7 and poor if his score lies between 7 and 14, and marginally poor if it lies between 14 and 21; vulnerable if it

TABLE 3
CLASSIFICATION OF THE HOUSEHOLD

Classification	Extremely poor	Poor	Marginally poor	Vulnerable	Middle - income	High income
Number of Households	0	10	30	35	25	0

Source: Primary data, 2011.

is in the range 21 to 28; middle income if the score is between 28 and 35 and high income if it is between 35 and 42.

Table 3 gives the poverty level of the respondents using the above criteria. The findings reveal that, taking the quality of life index, which includes food intake, income, expenditure, shelter, occupation and literacy level, 30 percent of the household fall under 'marginally poor' and 35 percent of the migrant workers fall under vulnerable group. Hence at any time these migrant households could fall under poor group. The risk of falling under poor is very high for these migrants. Already 10 percent of the households are poor. The analysis thus reveals that the quality of life of the chosen sample migrant households is far from satisfactory. They need better living environment and the income they receive also is not adequate.

Conclusion The current study exhibits that economic factors outweigh social factors for the people to migrate. The findings of the study further corroborate the Todaro model of migration which says that migration takes place because of differences in expected wage rates. The study further reconfirms the need of balanced regional development. Though the migrants of the current study are provided with proper basic amenities yet their quality of life index does not seem to be satisfactory. The basic amenities available to the migrants have to be improved and that the migrants have to be given proper training to enhance their levels of living.

REFERENCES

- Barik, B.C (1994), "Rural Migrants in an Urban Setting", Classical Publishing Company, New Delhi
- Lee (2003), "Gender, Migration and Civil Activism in South Korea", in "Gender Migration and Governance in Asia", Vol. 12 (1-2).
- Seeta K. Prabu (2009), 'Mobility is a Force for Good in Rural India'- Wall Street Journal, Monday, Dec 2009, www.RemittancesGateway.org,
- Saxena R.P and Bedi, I.S (1966), "Rural Out-migration from Four Villages", Journal of the Institute of Economic Research, Vol.1. No.2 July, pp.38-46.
- Todaro, M.P (1976), "Internal Migration in Developing Countries: A Review of Theory, Evidence, Methodology and Research Prioritism", International Labour Organisation, Geneva.

- Stark, O (1991), "The Migration of Labour", Basil Blackwell, Cambridge, MA