

Determinants and Factors Related to Migration of Labourers to Industries in Ludhiana, Punjab

* *Shruti Mehra*

** *Gian Singh*

Abstract

People migrate in search of better opportunities to earn a livelihood and for a better socioeconomic environment. It is important to know the reasons for which the individuals migrate and the factors related to the same so as to know about the kind of environment they lived in before migration and also, their dire need to migrate. The present study concentrates on detailed factors responsible for migration, costs involved and problems faced by migrant labourers working in the industries of Ludhiana city. Economic factors were identified as the most common factors responsible for migration. Relatives were the most common source through whom Ludhiana city was selected as the destination place for migration. The majority of the industrial migrant labourers incurred a cost up-to ₹ 400 for traveling to Ludhiana city and often faced problems while travelling to the city.

Keywords: migration, industrial immigrant labour, determinants of migration, economic factors of migration, plight of migrants, labourers in Ludhiana, labour mobility

JEL Classification: J61, J62, O15

Paper Submission Date : June 5, 2013 ; Paper sent back for Revision : August 5, 2013 ; Paper Acceptance Date : August 18, 2013

Migration is a universal phenomenon since the state attracting migrants also ejects its people to other states. Thus, shortages and surpluses of labour and the phenomenon of migration are sector/occupation specific rather than state/region specific. Regional inequalities in India have more so arisen from the path of development of the country. It has created a gap between agriculturally and industrially developed areas which create a demand for labour, and agriculturally and industrially backward areas which act as sources of supply of labour. A proper study of the reasons for migration as well as consequences is required in order to frame policy decisions (Ghaffari & Singh, 2004).

More than one-fourth of the Indian population (26%) is living below the poverty line. One-fourth of the country's poor people (i.e. 25%) reside in urban areas, but only 69% of this population is above the poverty line, and 31% of the urban population is poor. Lack of ownership of assets, unemployment, lower wages, malnutrition, illiteracy, and backward social status lead to the poverty syndrome. Poverty is a phenomenon which is a vicious circle. The poor have very little access to credit facilities and the ones who have it, pay a high price for it. To fight back the problem of poverty, employment is the key factor (Parthasarathy, 1996). The term 'poverty' has difficult meanings, but the general consensus is that poverty attains relative and pragmatic dimensions only with a relative framework. The commonly known meanings to define poverty or poor people are, "people who lack minimum necessities to sustain life," and the second meaning is established by using income and expenditure data. The multi-factors or characteristics of poverty are housing, education, employment, health, fertility, mortality, and mental satisfaction (Reddy, 1989).

The focus of the present study is on the industrial migrant labourers who have migrated from the different parts of the country, especially from the rural areas to the industries in Ludhiana city. It is believed that migration of labour force from rural to urban areas in different countries of the world, especially the third world countries, is not a new phenomenon. Rural to urban migration may be in different forms like - seasonal migration, which is one of the forms of diversification that takes place in the rural areas and circular migration, under which the rural households shift their dependence for livelihood temporarily from local to external far off areas. They maintain close links with their areas of origin where they return regularly and remit substantial part of their incomes (Rani & Shylendra, 2001).

* *Research Scholar*, Department of Economics and Sociology, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana - 141 004, Punjab. Email : shrutibhogal@gmail.com

** *Professor*, Department of Economics, Punjabi University, Patiala - 147 002, Punjab. E-mail: giansingh88@yahoo.com

Objective of the Study

The objective of the present study is to study the determinants of migration and to examine the various factors related to migration to the industries of Ludhiana city.

Research Methodology

For the present study, a sample of 500 industrial migrant labourers were surveyed from various hosiery and knitwear and cycle and cycle parts industrial units of Ludhiana city. The primary data was collected through a survey which was facilitated by a structured questionnaire and group discussions. The secondary data was solicited from different reports and institutions. Statistical tools like percentage, average, *t*-test, and chi-square test were used. The time period of the study is from 2008 - 2012.

Results and Discussions

The various empirical studies on migration highlight various factors responsible for an individual to migrate from his place of origin or last place of residence to a new place of destination. Often, an individual migrates from an area with little opportunities to the one with more opportunities. The various determinants or factors of migration can be classified into 'push factors' and 'pull factors'. The 'push factors' are the ones which force an individual to leave his/her present place and move to a new place. These factors can be poverty, unemployment, indebtedness, exploitation, illiteracy, ownership of very little or no land and various other reasons, while 'pull factors' are the ones which attract or pull the migrants towards a new place of destination. The pull factors have been identified as pursuing higher studies, better educational, medical and health facilities, political factors and social security, infrastructural facilities and public services, opportunities for employment and business, lifestyle of the city, modern amenities, recreational facilities, and better social status. The people who are usually pulled are educated, skilled, and economically sound.

(i) Determinants of Migration : In the study, a total of 32 factors were identified, which were responsible for migration of labourers. The overall distribution of the industrial migrant labourers - according to the factors responsible for migration and getting employed in the total industrial units of Ludhiana city - is shown in the Table 1. It was found that on the whole, as many as 49.49%, 20.51%, 14.87%, 15.13%, and 12.82 % of the industrial migrant labourers from small scale industrial units migrated due to Attraction of Getting Higher Wages as compared to the Last Place of Residence, Crime, Corruption, Caste Exploitation, and Political Exploitation respectively, as compared to 46.36% , 17.27%, 14.55%, 23.64%, and 28.18% respectively, who migrated from large/medium scale industrial units. The Z-test values of 3.17, 5.55, 5.56, 4.08, and 1.69 indicate significant differences in the two proportions of industrial migrant labourers who migrated due to the above-mentioned reasons.

As much as 14.10%, 55.12%, 10.26%, 21.28 %, 20%, and 18.21% of the industrial migrant labourers from small scale units explained that they migrated due to Mistreatment by Previous Employers, Poverty, Cultural and Social Exploitation, Pushed by Parents/Relatives/Friends, Lack of Skilled Work, and Lack of Technology as compared to 28.18% , 51.18%, 29.09%, 33.64% , 32.73%, and 50.00% of labourers respectively who migrated from large / medium-scale industrial units due to the same reasons. The differences in the two proportions of industrial migrant labourers for the above-mentioned reasons were found to be non-significant.

The Z -test values of 2.30, 2.71, 2.58, 2.51, 2.45, 4.03, and 3.12 indicate a significant difference in the two proportions of industrial migrant labourers working in the small-scale units and large/medium scale units for the reasons like Lack of Irrigational Facilities, Ancestral Trends of Migration, Marital Purposes, Insufficient Land Holding, Employment Diversification, Better Transport Facilities, and Family Disputes respectively. The percentages of industrial migrant labourers from small-scale industrial units who reported the above-mentioned reasons were 17.44%, 30.26%, 7.69%, 27.44%, 27.44%, 12.56%, and 21.79% respectively, as compared to 31.82%, 59.09%, 13.64%, 21.82%, 18.18%, 35.45%, and 23.64% of the labourers respectively, who were from the large/medium scale industrial units. As much as 12.82 % of the industrial migrant labourers from small scale industrial units and 44.55 % of the industrial migrant labourers from large/medium scale industrial units migrated due to Lack of Schools/Hospitals at the Place of Origin. A little below 14% and 34% of the industrial migrant labourers from small scale and large/medium scale industrial units respectively migrated due to Non-availability of Houses.

Table 1: Distribution of Total Industrial Migrant Labourers According to Factors Responsible for Migration to Ludhiana City (Multiple Responses)

Sl. No.	Factors	Small		Large/Medium		Total		Overall Rank	Z-test value
		No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage		Small v/s Large/ Medium
1.	Attraction of getting a higher wage as compared to the last place of residence	193	49.49	51	46.36	244	48.80	2	3.17***
2.	Mistreatment by previous employers	55	14.10	31	28.18	86	17.20	18	0.29
3.	Poverty	215	55.12	57	51.18	272	54.40	1	0.62
4.	Crime	80	20.51	19	17.27	99	19.80	14	5.55***
5.	Corruption	58	14.87	16	14.55	74	14.80	21	5.56***
6.	Caste exploitation	59	15.13	26	23.64	85	17.00	19	4.08***
7.	Political exploitation	50	12.82	31	28.18	81	16.20	7	1.69*
8.	Cultural and social exploitation	40	10.26	32	29.09	72	14.40	22	1.17
9.	Pushed by parents/relatives/ friends	83	21.28	37	33.64	120	24.00	9	0.91
10.	Lack of irrigational facilities	68	17.44	35	31.82	103	20.60	13	2.30**
11.	Lack of skilled work	78	20.00	36	32.73	114	22.80	10	0.33
12.	Lack of technology	71	18.21	55	50.00	126	25.20	8	1.51
13.	Lack of schools/ hospitals	50	12.82	49	44.55	99	19.80	14	1.64
14.	Indebtedness	145	37.18	41	37.27	186	37.20	3	0.02
15.	Non-availability of houses	54	13.85	37	33.64	91	18.20	16	0.09
16.	Ancestral trend of migration	118	30.26	65	59.09	183	36.60	4	2.71***
17.	Marital purposes	30	7.69	15	13.64	45	9.00	27	2.58***
18.	Land holding was not enough	107	27.44	24	21.82	131	26.20	6	2.51**
19.	Employment diversification	107	27.44	20	18.18	127	25.40	7	2.45**
20.	Better transport facilities	49	12.56	39	35.45	88	17.60	17	4.03***
21.	Family disputes	85	21.79	26	23.64	111	22.20	11	3.12***
22.	Off season of work in the native place	90	23.08	18	16.36	108	21.60	12	1.59
23.	Most of the people in the native place migrated, so did you	95	24.36	25	22.73	120	24.00	9	2.26**
24.	Adventure	55	14.10	21	19.09	76	15.20	20	0.09
25.	To gain experience & skills and then to go back home and start own business	78	20.00	17	15.45	95	19.00	15	4.97***
26.	Want to shift from ancestral work	50	12.82	11	10.00	61	12.20	24	1.49
27.	Natural calamity (droughts/famines etc.)	50	12.82	6	5.45	56	11.20	25	1.38
28.	To get rid of social and family feuds	39	10.00	3	2.73	42	8.40	28	2.16**
29.	To become a nuclear family	42	10.77	5	4.55	47	9.40	26	2.74***
30.	In search of favourable environment in terms of housing and other social amenities like recreational facilities	55	14.10	6	5.45	61	12.20	24	0.94
31.	Better conditions of work	61	15.64	4	3.64	65	13.00	23	2.43**
32.	Continuous employment	148	37.95	11	10.00	159	31.80	5	1.29
Source: Field Survey, 2008-09									
Note: * Significant at 10%									
** Significant at 5%									
*** Significant at 1%									

The differences in the two proportions of industrial migrant labourers for the above-mentioned reasons were found to be non-significant. Also, similar differences were found to be non-significant for reasons like Off-season of Work in Native Place, Adventure, Desire to Shift from Ancestral Trend of Work, and Natural Calamity, since the percentage of industrial migrant labourers from small-scale industrial units who migrated due to these reasons were 23.08%, 14.10%, 12.82%, and 12.82% respectively, as compared to 16.36%, 19.09%, 10.00%, and 5.45% of the labourers respectively from large/medium scale units.

The Z-test values of 2.26, 4.97, 2.16, 2.74, and 2.43 indicate a significant difference in the two proportions of industrial migrant labourers who migrated due to Trend of Migration Adopted by Other People at Native Place, To Gain Experience & Skills and then to go back to the Native Place, To get rid of Social and Family Feuds, To Become a Nuclear Family, and Better Conditions of Work since 24.36%, 20.00%, 10.00%, 10.77%, and 15.64% of the industrial migrant labourers from small scale industrial units respectively migrated due to the afore-mentioned reasons as compared to 22.73%, 15.45%, 2.73 %, 4.55%, and 3.64% of the industrial migrant labourers who migrated from large/medium scale industrial units respectively. As much as 14.10% and 5.45% of the industrial migrant labourers from small-scale and large/medium scale industrial units respectively migrated in search of Favourable Environment in Terms of Housing and Other Social Incentives, while 37.95% and 10.00% of the industrial migrant labourers from small-scale and large/medium scale industrial units respectively migrated to Gain Continuous Employment. The differences in the two proportions of industrial migrant labourers for the above-mentioned reasons were found to be non-significant.

(ii) Place of Origin : The Table 2 shows that the overall percentage of sampled industrial migrant labourers migrating from Uttar Pradesh to the industrial units of Ludhiana city was the highest (56.80%), followed by those from Bihar (30.40%), Himachal Pradesh (12.40%), and the contribution of other states was very low. The trend was similar for the overall, small-scale, and large/medium scale units as the percentages of industrial migrant labourers migrating from the small-scale units from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Himachal Pradesh were 60.26%, 28.46%, and 11.28% respectively. However, none of the industrial migrant labourers under the survey from the small scale units were from other states. Similarly, the percentages of industrial migrant labourers from the large/medium scale units who migrated from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Himachal Pradesh and other states were 44.55%, 37.27 %, 16.36%, and 1.82 % respectively.

Table 2 : Distribution of Industrial Migrant Labourers According to their Place of Origin						
Place of Origin	Small		Large/Medium		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
A. Hosiery & knitwear						
Uttar Pradesh	94	48.21	17	30.91	111	44.40
Bihar	82	42.05	23	41.82	105	42.00
Himachal Pradesh	19	9.74	13	23.64	32	12.80
Other States	0	0.00	2	3.64	2	0.80
B. Cycle & cycle parts						
Uttar Pradesh	141	72.31	32	58.18	173	69.20
Bihar	29	14.87	18	32.73	47	18.80
Himachal Pradesh	25	12.82	5	9.09	30	12.00
Other States	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
C. Total						
Uttar Pradesh	235	60.26	49	44.55	284	56.80
Bihar	111	28.46	41	37.27	152	30.40
Himachal Pradesh	44	11.28	18	16.36	62	12.40
Other States	0	0.00	2	1.82	2	0.40

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

(iii) Source of Selecting Ludhiana City : Majority of the industrial migrant labourers migrate to a new place after being assured of some initial help from someone. The migrants often have friends and relatives settled in different parts of the country on whom they usually depend. The Table 3 shows the distribution of industrial migrant labourers according to the source of selecting the present place. The question, when posed to the sampled labourers during the survey, received multiple responses.

Table 3 : Distribution of Industrial Migrant Labourers According to Source of Selecting Ludhiana City							
Source of Selection	Small		Large/Medium		Total		Overall Rank
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	
A. Hosiery & Knitwear							
Agents	2	1.03	0	0.00	2	0.80	5
Friends	39	20.00	11	20.00	50	20.00	2
Parents	12	6.15	0	0.00	12	4.80	3
Relatives	135	69.23	42	76.36	177	70.80	1
Self	7	3.59	2	3.64	9	3.60	4
B. Cycle & Cycle Parts							
Agents	1	0.51	0	0.00	1	0.40	5
Friends	34	17.44	10	18.18	44	17.60	2
Parents	9	4.62	0	0.00	9	3.60	4
Relatives	100	51.28	45	81.82	145	58.00	1
Self	11	5.64	0	0.00	11	4.40	3
C. Total							
Agents	3	0.77	0	0.00	3	0.60	5
Friends	73	18.72	21	19.09	94	18.80	2
Parents	21	5.38	0	0.00	21	4.20	3
Relatives	235	60.26	87	79.09	322	64.40	1
Self	18	4.62	2	1.82	20	4.00	4
Source: Field Survey, 2008-09							

Overall, 64.40% of the industrial migrant labourers came to Ludhiana city with their Relatives, followed by 18.80%, who selected Ludhiana city due to their Friends. As many as 4.20% came with their Parents, 4.00% came on their Own, while only 0.60% came through Agents. From the small scale units, as much as 60.26% of the industrial migrant labourers came through their Relatives as compared to 79.09%, who came from large/medium scale industrial units. The second most common source of migration was Friends as 18.72 % and 19.09 % of the industrial migrant labourers from the small scale and large/medium scale industrial units respectively came to Ludhiana city through them. As much as 5.38% of the industrial migrant labourers from small scale industrial units came with their Parents, while none of the industrial migrant labourers from large/medium scale industrial units did so. The percentages of the industrial migrant labourers from small scale and large/medium scale industrial units who came on their Own were 4.62% and 1.82% respectively. Only 0.77% of the industrial migrant labourers from small-scale units and none from large/medium scale industrial units came through Agents.

(iv) Mode of Travel to Ludhiana City : The Table 4 shows the distribution of industrial migrant labourers according to their mode of travel to Ludhiana city. One of the important pull factors which influences an individual to migrate is the easy availability and easy access to transport facilities. Majority of the industrial migrant labourers migrating to Ludhiana city depended upon Rail and Bus services. It was found that majority of the industrial migrant labourers migrating to the industrial units in Ludhiana city migrated from the previous place of residence through Rail (94.60%), followed by a small percentage (4.60%) who migrated by using Bus services. The contribution of Trucks or other means of transport was almost negligible (0.40%). Overall, a similar trend was witnessed amongst the industrial

Table 4 : Distribution of Industrial Migrant Labourers According to Mode of Travel to Ludhiana City							
Mode of Traveling	Small		Large/Medium		Total		Overall Rank
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	
A. Hosiery & Knitwear							
Rail	187	95.90	55	100.00	242	96.80	1
Bus	4	2.05	0	0.00	4	1.60	2
Truck	2	1.03	0	0.00	2	0.80	3
Any Other	2	1.03	0	0.00	2	0.80	3
B. Cycle & Cycle Parts							
Rail	181	92.82	50	90.91	231	92.40	1
Bus	14	7.18	5	9.09	19	7.60	2
Truck	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	
Any Other	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	
C. Total							
Rail	368	94.36	105	95.45	473	94.60	1
Bus	18	4.62	5	4.55	23	4.60	2
Truck	2	0.51	0	0.00	2	0.40	3
Any Other	2	0.51	0	0.00	2	0.40	3
Source: Field Survey, 2008-09							

migrant labourers from small scale and large/medium scale industrial units as the percentage of those who migrated using Trains were the highest (94.36% and 95.45% respectively). The percentage of those who depended upon bus services were 4.62% and 4.55% respectively. A small and equal percentage of industrial migrant labourers from the small-scale industrial units who depended upon Truck and other sources of transport to travel to Ludhiana city were 0.51% each.

(v) Expenditure Incurred for Travelling : The industrial migrant labourers migrate with a hope to earn money at a new place of destination, but in the process, incur some expenditure as well. It is important to know about the expenditure one incurs so as to find out the economic feasibility of migration. The Table 5 shows the distribution of industrial migrant labourers according to the expenditure incurred for traveling. It was found during the study that majority of the migrants traveled to the city via Trains. It was observed that a higher percentage of the industrial migrant labourers (37.20%) spent an amount in the range of ₹ 301-400 for traveling from their place of origin or previous place of residence to Ludhiana city, while 28.00% spent an amount in the range of ₹ 201-300. The percentages of industrial migrant labourers spending an amount between ₹ 101-200, more than ₹ 400, and less than ₹100 were 18.00%, 13.00%, and 3.80% respectively.

A similar trend was observed for the industrial migrant labourers from the small scale industrial units as the maximum percentage of the migrant labourers (39.23%) spent an amount in the range of ₹ 301-400, followed by 27.95%, 16.92%, 13.85%, and 2.05% of the labourers, who spent between ₹ 201-300, ₹ 101-200, above ₹ 400, and less than ₹ 100 respectively. Whereas, in the case of large/medium scale industrial units, the percentage of migrant labourers spending an amount in the range of ₹ 301-400 was 30.00%, followed by 28.18%, 21.82%, and 10.00% each who spent the amount in the range of ₹ 201-300, ₹ 101-200, less than ₹ 100 and more than ₹ 400 respectively.

(vi) Hardships Faced During the Travel to Ludhiana City : The industrial migrant labourers are subjected to different kinds of problems and mistreatment while traveling to different places. The Table 6 exhibits the hardships and problems faced by the industrial migrant labourers while traveling to Ludhiana city. The Table shows that overall, 49% of the industrial migrant labourers did not face any hardships while traveling to Ludhiana city, whereas 39% of these labourers faced problems from the Railway Police. As much as 8.60% of the industrial migrant labourers faced problems from Railway Authorities, while the percentage of those who were troubled by Passengers and others were 1.20% and 1.40 % respectively. A very small percentage of the labourers (0.80%) faced problems from their fellow

Table 5 : Distribution of Industrial Migrant Labourers According to Expenditure Incurred for Traveling to Ludhiana City

Expenditure for Traveling (in ₹)	Small		Large/Medium		Total		Overall Rank
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	
A. Hosiery & Knitwear							
Less than 100	3	1.54	2	3.64	5	2.00	5
101-200	20	10.26	1	1.82	21	8.40	4
201-300	43	22.05	16	29.09	59	23.60	2
301-400	86	44.10	27	49.09	113	45.20	1
More than 400	43	22.05	9	16.36	52	20.80	3
B. Cycle & Cycle Parts							
Less than 100	5	2.56	9	16.36	14	5.60	4
101-200	46	23.59	23	41.82	69	27.60	3
201-300	66	33.85	15	27.27	81	32.40	1
301-400	67	34.36	6	10.91	73	29.20	2
More than 400	11	5.64	2	3.64	13	5.20	5
C. Total							
Less than 100	8	2.05	11	10.00	19	3.80	5
101-200	66	16.92	24	21.82	90	18.00	3
201-300	109	27.95	31	28.18	140	28.00	2
301-400	153	39.23	33	30.00	186	37.20	1
More than 400	54	13.85	11	10.00	65	13.00	4
Source: Field Survey, 2008-09							

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

Friends. From the total small scale industrial units, 52.05% of the industrial migrant labourers did not happen to face any problem while traveling to Ludhiana city, whereas 40% and 4.87% of the industrial migrant labourers faced problems from the Railway Police and Railway Authorities respectively. The percentage of the industrial migrant labourers who faced problems from Friends, Fellow Passengers, and Others were 1.03% each. From the total large/medium scale industrial units, 38.18% of the migrant labourers did not face any problem, while 35.45% of the sampled labourers faced problems from the Railway Police. As many as 21.82% of the migrant labourers faced problems from the Railway Authorities, and 1.82% faced problems from Passengers, while the percentage of those who faced problems from Fellow Friends was nil.

Conclusion

Economic reasons were identified as the most common factors for migration of the industrial migrant labourers in Ludhiana city as factors like Poverty, Attraction of Getting Higher Wages as Compared to the Place of Origin, and Indebtedness were ranked as first, second, and third most common factors respectively. The least common factor for migration was for Marital Purposes. Relatives were the most common source for selecting Ludhiana city as the destination place for migration. Since people have relatives - both near and distant - settled in various places, they act as the most common source of attracting people for a new beginning at a new place. Majority of the migrants migrated from Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. This shows that the economic situation, both existing and future, in these states is not very good, which forces the people to migrate. The distance from these states can be conveniently and cheaply traveled through train, since majority of the industrial migrant labourers migrated to Ludhiana city through Train, with the maximum expenditure being up-to ₹ 400. Majority of the migrants complained of being troubled by Railway Police as they were harassed and mistreated by them for money.

Table 6 : Distribution of Industrial Migrant Labourers According to Hardships Faced During Travelling							
Mode of Traveling	Small		Large/Medium		Total		Overall Rank
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	
A. Hosiery & Knitwear							
Nil	91	46.67	34	61.82	125	50.00	
Railway officials	13	6.67	1	1.82	14	5.60	2
Railway police	82	42.05	15	27.27	97	38.80	1
Friends	3	1.54	0	0.00	3	1.20	4
Fellow Passengers	2	1.03	2	3.64	4	1.60	5
Others	4	2.05	3	5.45	7	2.80	3
B. Cycle & Cycle Parts							
Nil	112	57.44	8	14.55	120	48.00	
Railway officials	6	3.08	23	41.82	29	11.60	2
Railway police	74	37.95	24	43.64	98	39.20	1
Friends	1	0.51	0	0.00	1	0.40	4
Fellow Passengers	2	1.03	0	0.00	2	0.80	3
Others	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5
C. Total							
Nil	203	52.05	42	38.18	245	49.00	
Railway officials	19	4.87	24	21.82	43	8.60	2
Railway police	156	40.00	39	35.45	195	39.00	1
Friends	4	1.03	0	0.00	4	0.80	5
Fellow Passengers	4	1.03	2	1.82	6	1.20	4
Others	4	1.03	3	2.73	7	1.40	3
Source: Field Survey, 2008-09							

Policy Implications

Migrants are important for an economy as they provide supply of labour. Therefore, it is important to retain them and get them settled in the city. Migrants reported various reasons for migration like Poverty, Crime, Corruption, Political, Cultural, and Social Exploitation. Efforts should be made by the local government to protect the industrial migrant labourers from all such factors which influenced these labourers to migrate in the first place. Some of the other determinants of migration were Employment Diversification, Better Recreational and Transport Facilities, Search for Better Working Conditions, Employment, and Availability of Social Amenities. Efforts should be made by the local government to make all the above-said factors available in the local economy. These steps will not only benefit the labourers, but will also widen the economic opportunities available in the local economy, and will result in the overall development of the society, which would indirectly make the locals more competitive.

References

- Ghaffari, H., & Singh, S. P. (2004). Rural-urban migration: A search for economic determinants. *Indian Journal of Economics*, 84 (335), Part 4, 443-458.
- Parthasarathy, G. (1996). Recent trends in wages and employment of agricultural labour. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 51 (1, 2), 145-167.
- Rani, U., & Shylendra, H. S. (2001). Seasonal migration and rural-urban interface in semi-arid tropics of Gujarat: Study of a tribal village. *Journal of Rural Development*, 20 (2), 187-217.
- Reddy, G. N. (1989). Socio-psychological determinants of poverty: A review. *Journal of Rural Development*, 8 (4), 371-379.