

PUSH–PULL FACTORS OF MIGRATION AND OCCUPATIONAL CHOICES OF URBAN SLUM RESIDENTS

Rajneesh Behra

Assistant Professor at Regional Institute of Cooperative Management, Chandigarh

ABSTRACT

The present study examines the migration status of urban slum dwellers and reveals that most residents migrate to the city along with their families. The primary reason for migration is the search for employment, followed by the pursuit of higher income opportunities available in urban areas. In terms of employment categories, the majority of migrants are engaged as junk collectors, with others working as rickshaw pullers or in local mandis. These findings indicate that urban slum dwellers are predominantly involved in informal sector activities to sustain their daily livelihoods.

Keywords: Migration, Employment, Urbanization, poverty, and Slum Dwellers.

INTRODUCTION

Urbanization and Industrialization are two fundamental forces which bring about rapid change in urban society. Urbanization does not merely refer to the concentration of population in the cities, but it also results in complex and complicated problems associated with it. It is a constellation of many sub-cultures which have developed and formed in the process of urbanization and migration (Dhadve, 1962). While urbanization provide opportunities and new possibilities, there are problems posed by urbanization are often formidable and more baffling than problems in rural areas. Urban poverty is one such problem which is considered to be both a major cause and consequence of urban problems. In the growth of urbanization, migration plays an important role in both developing and developed countries. This positive implication of migration has created many problems in the cities e.g. excessive pressure on existing facilities of housing, education, medical, water supply and unemployment etc. due to excessive and surplus nature of population (Sobat, 1975).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Slum formation has become a major challenge linked to rapid urbanization, affecting nearly all Indian cities. The Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act of 1956 sought to address the issue but fell short, allowing slums to expand further (Census of India, 2001). In 1985, the Town and Country Planning Organization documented slum conditions nationwide and reviewed past interventions. The National Commission on Urbanization, established in 1988, conducted the first comprehensive assessment of urban challenges. The persistent growth of slums is driven by factors such as migration, poverty, rapid urbanization, and industrialization. The factors responsible for the unending growth of slums, varies from migration to poverty to urbanization to industrialization and so on, which remains the focused of various studies, such as,

D' Souza (1968) examined that the Chandigarh dream of a great architect, today faces the reality of large segment of its population living in slums shows that, one tenth of the population was found to be living in unplanned structure or hutments. His study also shows the close relationship between urban poverty and slums in the city.

Ali (1994) observed that the large-scale immigration of people from other states to Delhi has given rise to the existence and growth of unauthorized colonies, slums and jhuggi-jhoupri clusters. At present almost half of the total population in Delhi lives in sub-standard areas, not fit for human habitation. Sanitation condition of 45 resettlement colonies could be termed as unsatisfactory and are termed as “slums within slums” reason thereby the civil amenities are not adequate, poor management level of hygiene is found to be deplorable and lack of public participation.

Das (1999) has analyzed the Surat slums shows that large scale migrant workers and households to city from within Gujarat as well as different part of the country are attracted due to changing economic landscape of Surat. A large section of this immigrant population has been entering the city slums especially since the early eighties. At percent 29 percent of the entire city populations are residing in slums and majority of them located in its eastern half. As high as 80 percent of the slum dwellers in the city are migrants and predominantly from rural areas. Majority these migrants are from the states of Maharashtra, uttar Pradesh, Gujarat, Orissa, and Andhra Pradesh.

krishan (1993) has examined that the urban poor of Madurai live in 160 slums. The emergence of more industrial units in and around Madurai, the drought in the neighboring districts of pasumpon muthuramalingam, ramanathapuram, and rural-urban migration are responsible for the growth of slums in the city. Maximum numbers of slums are found along the banks of Vaigai River Madurai- Rameswaram railway line.

Chalapathi, Raghavalu, and Subramanyam (2008) observed that there exists a close nexus between urban poverty and slums and this nexus is getting more complicated in view of the rapid pace of urbanization without taking into consideration the alternative means of employment and livelihood to the migrating population from the rural areas to urban areas. The authors dwell on the problems emanating from urbanization and industrialization with specific focus on urban poverty in relation to mushroom growth of slums.

Smith (1973) and Dwyer (1975) have examined that social justice in the slums has been the main theme of developed countries, where as in developing countries the focus is on urban housing, urban poverty, and rural-urban migration.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

1. To identify the main reasons for migration among urban slum dwellers.
2. To examine the employment categories in which urban slum dwellers are primarily engaged.

SOURCE OF DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a descriptive research design to examine the migration status, purpose of migration, and employment categories of slum dwellers in Ludhiana city. The research is primarily field-based and involves direct interaction with residents across selected slum clusters. Primary data were collected through structured questionnaires, systematic on-site observations, and personal interviews with slum households. These tools enabled the collection of detailed information regarding socio-economic background, migration history, and occupational patterns. The analysis is supported by secondary data to provide contextual understanding and validate findings.

The study shows that a substantial majority 87.5 percent of respondent households fall below the poverty line. Only 12.5 percent are categorized as non-poor based on the poverty line

defined by the C. Rangarajan Committee. These figures clearly indicate that poverty is highly prevalent among the slum population.

Table No. 1: Comparison between Poor vs Non-Poor According to Migration Status

| | | Poverty | | | | Chi-Square | p-value |
|------------------------------|---|---------|--------|----------|-------|------------|---------|
| | | Poor | | Non-poor | Total | | |
| Migrate alone or with family | Not migrants | 44 | 12.6 % | 11 | 22.0% | 55 | 13.8% |
| | Alone | 113 | 32.3 % | 23 | 46.0% | 136 | 34.0% |
| | With Family | 193 | 55.1 % | 16 | 32.0% | 209 | 52.3% |
| Purpose of Migration | Not migrants | 44 | 12.6 % | 11 | 22.0% | 55 | 13.8% |
| | To search for employment | 220 | 62.9 % | 33 | 66.0% | 253 | 63.3% |
| | Due to any pressure in the family | 12 | 3.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 12 | 3.0% |
| | To find more income | 52 | 14.9 % | 3 | 6.0% | 55 | 13.8% |
| | Due to some financial difficulties like debt etc. | 19 | 5.4% | 3 | 6.0% | 22 | 5.5% |
| | Any other | 3 | .9% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | .8% |
| Employment category | Working in industry | 50 | 14.3 % | 9 | 18.0% | 59 | 14.8% |
| | Security guard | 8 | 2.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 8 | 2.0% |
| | Working in Atta chakki | 1 | .3% | 5 | 10.0% | 6 | 1.5% |
| | Driver | 8 | 2.3% | 3 | 6.0% | 11 | 2.8% |
| | Working in Mandi | 43 | 12.3 % | 6 | 12.0% | 49 | 12.3% |
| | General labour | 25 | 7.1% | 3 | 6.0% | 28 | 7.0% |
| | Rickshaw puller | 50 | 14.3 % | 4 | 8.0% | 54 | 13.5% |
| | Traditional occupation | 17 | 4.9% | 7 | 14.0% | 24 | 6.0% |
| | Junk collector | 148 | 42.3 % | 13 | 26.0% | 161 | 40.3% |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|------------|----|------------|---------|------------|--|--|
| Total | 350 | 100.0 % | 50 | 100.0 % | 40 0 | 100.0 % | | |
|-------|-----|------------|----|------------|---------|------------|--|--|

Migration status like migration with family or alone, purpose of migration and type of employment can be associated with the poverty. The above table no. 1 conveys that there is a significant association in poverty states for response related to migration and employment category, as the two-sided asymptotic significance of the chi-square statistic (0.008 and 0.001) are less than 0.01. Hence, major proportion of poor respondents 55.1 percent migrate with family, while most of non-poor respondents 46 percent migrate alone. According to employment, 42.3 percent of poor respondents and 26 percent of non-poor respondents were junk collector. Only 14.3 percent of poor and 18 percent of non-poor respondents were working in industry. Although, no significant association is observed in poverty states for purpose of migration. Thus, most of poor 62.9 percent as well as non-poor respondents 66 percent migrated due to search for employment.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the findings indicate that most slum dwellers migrated to the study area with their families, while a smaller proportion migrated individually. Employment emerged as the primary motive for migration, followed by the search for better income opportunities to sustain their livelihoods. In terms of occupation, the majority are involved in informal sector activities. Most residents work as junk collectors, followed by those employed in the grain market or mandi. Only a small percentage are engaged as security guards or as helpers at aata chakkis.

REFERENCES

1. Ali, S (1994), Environment and Resettlement Colonies, Har-Anand, Publications, New Delhi
2. Census of India 2001, "Slum Population," 640 Cities and Towns Reporting Slums, Series-1, Vol.1
3. Census of India 2001, "Punjab Provisional Population Totals".
4. Chalaputhi, B V, Raghaval B V and Subramanyam, P (2008), "Urban Poverty and Slums", Third Concept, June 2008.
5. Das, B (1999), Surat: The Diamond City of India, in. R P Misra and Kamlesh Misra, eds., Million Cities of India, Growth, Dynamis, Internal Structure, Quality of Life and Planning Perspectives, Vol.2. Sustainable Development Foundation, New Delhi.
6. D'Souza, Victor, S (1968), Social Structure of a Planned City – Chandigarh, Orient Longmans Ltd. Bombay.
7. Dhadave, M S (1969), Sociology of Slum, Archives Books, New Delhi.
8. Gopal, K and Singh N (1993), The Political Economy of Indian Urbanization, in J Didde and V Rangaswamy eds., Urbanization, Trends, Perspectives and Challenges, Rawat Publications, Jaipur and New Delhi. New York.
9. Sobat, R H (1975), The Measurement of Urban Surplus labour, WB, mineo No. 75, Washington, D.C. 1975.
10. Town and Country Planning Organization (1985), "A Compendium on Indian Slums", Govt. of India, New Delhi.