



Socio-Demographic Determinants in Urban 'In-migrants' of Uttarakhand

SD Kandpal¹, Rakesh Kakkar¹, Pradeep Aggarwal², Debabrata Roy³

Financial Support: None declared

Conflict of Interest: None declared

Copy Right: The Journal retains the copyrights of this article. However, reproduction is permissible with due acknowledgement of the source.

How to cite this article:

Kandpal SD, Kakkar R, Aggarwal P, Roy D. Socio-Demographic Determinants in Urban 'In-migrants' of Uttarakhand. Natl J Community Med 2018;9(7):463-468

Author's Affiliation:

¹Professor; ²Associate Professor, Dept of Community Medicine, Himalayan Institute of Medical Sciences, HIHT University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand; ³Professor, Deptt. of Community Medicine, Shridev Suman Subharti Medical College, Dehradun, Uttarakhand

Correspondence

Dr. Rakesh Kakkar
drrakesh75@rediffmail.com

Date of Submission: 03-06-17

Date of Acceptance: 13-07-18

Date of Publication: 31-07-18

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Rapid urban growth largely manifests itself in the expansion of already crowded squatter settlements and slums, placing enormous strain on public resources and presenting challenges for local health authorities. To identify the socio-demographic and other related factors of urban in-migrants of districts Dehradun & Haridwar of Uttarakhand.

Methods: An observational, cross sectional study was planned among 09 settlements/slums of Urban in-migrants from districts Dehradun & Haridwar of Uttarakhand. Multi-stage & systematic random sampling method was chosen for probability sample of 609 households constituting 3485 females of reproductive age-group (15-49 years) as study population.

Results: Maximum number of in-migrants was from the state of Bihar (33%) and Uttar Pradesh (32.2%). Majority of in-migrants lived in Overcrowded houses (86.53%) and in-adequate ventilation facilities (87.53%). 45.25% of the study population was illiterate & 58.05% was unskilled labor. 71(78.88%) children in the age group of 10-19 years were employed as unskilled labor.

Conclusion: Majority of the migrants are poor, illiterate from backward communities. In cities, these floating population refrains from seeking health services especially from organized public & private sector due to various reasons like poverty, illiteracy, ignorance.

Key Words: Urban, In-migrants, determinants, Sociodemographic, slums

INTRODUCTION

Rapid urbanization has occurred throughout low-income countries, where 80 % of the world's largest cities are now located.¹Such rapid urban growth largely manifests itself in the expansion of already crowded squatter settlements and slums, placing enormous strain on public resources and presenting challenges for local health authorities. ²
³

People often migrate from rural to urban areas within a country or from less developed to more developed countries for better life opportunities.⁴Large numbers of young people are migrating because rural India is saturated and cannot pro-

vide employment opportunities for a growing population. Many end up as rag pickers or casual construction workers. They come alone and then bring their relatives or friends. It is a chain migration. Internal migrants and tribal populations are vulnerable in India and migrant communities in urban areas are at the risk of low health-care access.⁵

The settlements comprise of dwellings, constructed with unconventional materials like waste wooden planks, gunny bags, polythene sheets, etc, with no bathroom/ toilet facilities. Most of the people go for open field defecation and use common public taps and for washing their clothes near open

drains, exposing themselves to various infections. Health is not a priority need for such people living in subsistence & health services are barely available and even if so, in most instances not easily accessible.

A systematic data base including information on health-risk assessment of the itinerant or mobile population particularly with reference to our socio-demographic perspective has continued to remain a felt need. Keeping in view the above factors an extramural research study was planned and conducted among the Urban in-migrants from districts Dehradun & Haridwar of Uttarakhand. The present study can be said to have pioneered such an initiative in Uttarakhand by taking into account an epidemiologically significant in-migrant, semi-skilled 'labour selling' population living in make-shift assortment of dwellings along the mountainous rivulets or the 'Ganges' as these flow into the Doon valley and Haridwar. The findings being discussed in the present research article are a part of this larger extra mural research study.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

This study was conducted to identify the socio-demographic and other related factors of urban in-migrants of districts Dehradun & Haridwar of Uttarakhand.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study design was observational and cross sectional. The study area consisted of 09 settlements/slums in districts Dehradun & Haridwar. The details of the same are given in the box.

Study population included In-migrant slum households / make-shift settlements in the selected clusters. In present study 'In-Migrant' population have been defined as spatial movement of landless, unskilled / semiskilled, 'labour selling', illiterate, poor population with no choice of job and living in 'make shift' settlements / households along the banks of the rivers. The study considered those In-

migrants who were residing within a maximum distance of 50 mtrs from the river bank. and those residing for ≥ 6 Month as 'stable' and those residing for < 6 months as 'unstable' In-migrants.

For selection of requisite sample study subjects multi-stage & systematic random sampling method was chosen to ascertain the study population. At stage I, a probability sample of 11,706 population from 09 slum/population clusters have been taken from an universe of 1,37,508 population from 88 settlements/ population clusters with a sampling interval of 10 in each of the districts of Dehradun and Haridwar. Further, at stage II, a probability sample of 609 settlements/households from the 09 selected clusters with a sampling interval of 4 have been taken i.e an estimated 3485 study population residing in 609 households were taken from 09 selected slums comprised the sample size (giving a family size of approximately 5.72). Females of reproductive age-group (15-49 years) from each sampled household were considered as the study subjects.

Study protocol: As per the ICMR guidelines, project staff was recruited and a three (03) days orientation cum training workshop was organized for them. Principal investigator & Co-investigators were the trainer / facilitator for the same workshop.

After training of project staff, questionnaires were field tested. Based on the observations of the field staff and investigators questionnaire were modified & finalized.

Study tools used Oral questionnaire method: After pilot testing of the questionnaire, the final questionnaire was applied in the field i.e. the social workers recruited for these projects were allotted different clusters. These social workers under the supervision of Senior Research Fellow visited the respective households in their clusters and interviewed the 15-49 years females in that household. All the responses given by the respondent were entered into the questionnaire. At least three visits were made by the social workers in case the house was found locked / respondent was absent.

Districts and Clusters	Total Population	Total Households	Sample population	Sample households
Dehradun				
Mayakund	3202	640	965	164
BalmikiBasti	2633	527	752	134
ChidiyaMandi	1250	250	420	76
SaperaBasti	500	100	128	24
Haridwar				
IndraBasti	400	80	110	20
Labour Colony	1109	222	315	55
MohammedanBasti	1212	242	372	61
Rajeev Nagar	1000	200	309	55
SaperaBasti	400	80	114	20
Total 09 clusters	11706	2341	3485	609

Supervision of field work: The investigators monitored the field work from time to time to ensure the quality of the survey. 10% of the total households were monitored/cross checked by them by making field visits to the respective clusters.

Data Management and statistical analysis: As soon as the survey of the cluster was completed it was entered in the Master Table using the SPSS software package by the data entry operator. Suitable statistical tests were applied to the data to find out the significance of association between various variables under study. Generated data analyzed & interpreted along with descriptive methods by application of appropriate statistical tests for significance.

RESULTS

It can be observed from Table 1 that maximum number of in-migrants were from the state of Bihar (33%) followed by Uttar Pradesh (32.2%). About 23.8% of in-migrants were from different districts of Uttarakhand state itself.

The main reason cited by the in-migrants for their migration to districts Haridwar and Dehradun was in search of employment (80.49%) (Table-2).

Most of the migrants (98.51%) belonged to lower Socio-Economic status (classes III, IV & V) whereas only 0.65% belonged to upper class as per modified B.G.Prasad classification. (Table-3).

74.2% of in-migrants lived as nuclear families. Majority of in-migrants lived in Overcrowded houses (86.53%) and in-adequate ventilation facilities (87.53%). Although the Table 4 shows use of Sanitary latrines by 63.7% by the urban in-migrants which is surprisingly a high percentage keeping in view their socio-economic status, but this figure (63.7%) also includes those in-migrants who are using the facilities of paid "Shauchalaya" in their vicinity at the rate of Rs 5/- per single use of toilet. Some of them may not have correctly understood the meaning of sanitary latrines. 35.46% was going for open field defecation. 95.07% of them had open drainage system. It was recorded that 1.3% of in-migrants were consuming river water for daily use whereas tap water supply (Nagar Nigam) was available to 64.03% of migrants.

It was observed in the present study that 45.25% of the study population was illiterate. 4.59% were intermediate while only 1.56% were graduate and above. (Table-5)

299 belong to 7-9 years (students), 629 were students in 10-19 years and 72 were students in 20-29 years.

Table 1- Distribution of in-migrant families according to original State of residence (n=609)

State	Families (%)
Bengal	41 (6.7)
Bihar	201 (33)
Delhi	1 (0.2)
Haryana	2 (0.3)
Madhya Pradesh	2 (0.3)
Punjab	20 (3.3)
Rajasthan	1 (0.2)
Uttar Pradesh	196 (32.2)
Uttarakhand (from other districts)	145 (23.8)

Table 2- Distribution of in-migrants showing reasons for migration (n=609)

Reasons for migration	Families(%)
Employment	490 (80.49)
Own a house/ Native of this place	90 (14.91)
Married here	12 (1.96)
Rented a house in this locality/ Residence facility in this locality	11 (1.82)
Displaced due to dam in old Tehri District	2 (0.26)
Divorce /Disharmony at home	2 (0.26)
By Choice	1 (0.13)
Due to schooling	1 (0.13)

Table 3-Distribution of migrants by Social Class (n=609)

Social Class (modified B.G. Prasad classification)	Families (%)
Upper Class I	4 (0.65)
Upper Middle Class II	5 (0.82)
Lower Middle Class III	16 (2.63)
Upper Lower Class IV	297 (48.76)
Lower Class V	287 (47.12)
Total	609 (100)

Table 4-Distribution of migrants by Socio-demographic characteristics (n=609)

Factors	Families (%)
Type of family	
Nuclear	452 (74.2)
Joint	157 (25.8)
Overcrowding	
Present	527 (86.53)
Absent	82 (13.47)
Ventilation	
Adequate	76 (12.47)
In-Adequate	533 (87.53)
Type of toilet	
Sanitary	388 (63.71)
Insanitary	5 (0.82)
Others	216 (35.46)
Drainage system	
Open	579 (95.07)
Close	30 (4.93)
Source of Water Supply	
Tap	390 (64.03)
Hand pump	211 (34.64)
River	8 (1.33)

Table 5- Distribution of migrant family members according to age group and Education (n=2710)**

Age group	Education status							Total
	Graduate or above	Intermediate	High School	Junior High school	Primary	Just literate	Illiterate	
7-9	0	0	0	0	267(89.29)	12(4.01)	20(6.69)	299
10-19	0	44(6.12)	73(10.16)	160(22.28)	264(36.76)	22(3.06)	155(21.58)	719
20-29	18(2.76)	38(5.83)	61(9.37)	109(16.74)	83(12.74)	51(7.83)	291(44.70)	652
30-39	13(2.00)	19(2.93)	45(6.93)	85(13.09)	60(9.24)	38(5.85)	389(59.93)	649
40-49	6(4.22)	8(5.63)	8(5.63)	5(3.52)	4(2.81)	14(9.85)	97(68.30)	142
50-59	0	1(0.93)	1(0.93)	6(5.60)	5(4.67)	3(2.80)	91(85.04)	108
60 &+	3(2.15)	7(5.03)	7(5.03)	8(5.75)	8(5.75)	6(4.31)	100(71.94)	141
Total	40 (1.56)	117 (4.59)	195 (7.65)	373(14.63)	534(20.95)	136(5.33)	1153(45.25)	2710

**775 migrants were upto 7 years of age and hence not included.

Table 6- Distribution of migrant family members according to age group and Occupation (n=1710*)

Age code	Unskilled labour	Skilled labour	Farmer	Shopkeeper	Professional Service	Housewife	Unemployed**	Total
10-19	71(78.88)	1(1.11)	0	0	0	1(1.11)	17(18.88)	90
20-29	291(50.17)	0	1(0.17)	3(0.51)	2(0.34)	12(2.06)	271(46.72)	580
30-39	438(66.56)	12(1.82)	1(0.15)	4(0.60)	5(0.76)	14(2.12)	178(27.05)	649
40-49	80(58.82)	2(1.47)	0	0	2(1.47)	11(8.08)	40(29.41)	142
50-59	59(54.12)	0	0	1(0.91)	0	3(2.75)	37(33.94)	108
60 and +	56(39.71)	2(1.41)	0	4(2.83)	0	12(8.51)	24(17.02)	141
Total	995 (58.05)	17 (0.99)	2(0.11)	12(0.70)	9(0.52)	53(3.09)	567(33.08)	1710

*1775migrants were not applicable for the category of occupation, out of 1775, 775- were upto 7

**Includes members not in a position to work /retired

58.05% of the study population was unskilled labor. Surprisingly, it was revealed that 71(78.88%) children in the age group of 10-19 years were employed as unskilled labor, 1(1.11%) as skilled labor and service. (Table-6).

DISCUSSION

In urban slums where large numbers of in-migrants from different states were residing and this floating population refrains from seeking health services especially from organized public & private sector due to various reasons like poverty, illiteracy, ignorance. This population is not registered into government records due to its migratory nature. Estimated floating population in Uttarakhand is 300-350 lakhs as per census 2011.⁶

In another study, among the migrants in the urban areas, 59 % migrated from the rural areas and 40 % from urban areas, this shows major migration occurs from rural to urban and small urban cities to large urban cities with an employment potential. ⁷Though 2011 Census reveals migration from all hill districts of the State. Excepting two Hill Districts, all others hover around a population growth rate of 5 percent with Almora and Pauri Districts showing a negative population growth of -1.73 % and -1.51 % respectively against a national average of 17 %. Thus, hill districts have shown very low growth rates & this highlights the trend of migration from the hills mainly for seeking employment

in plains.⁸While as in one of the initiative by UPA government, objectives of the MGNREGA is to arrest out-migration of unskilled, landless labour force from the rural areas to urban areas.⁷

The agricultural labourer’s belongs to Schedule Caste are more likely to migrate in the study area.

The Table 3 highlights the availability and conditions of the basic living facilities of the respondents at the destination. According to the information given in the table, 85.8% of the migrant labourer’s were living in the tin sheds at destination place which were not in good condition whereas 14.2% of the people living in rented houses.

There are many reasons behind the seasonal migration of agriculture labourer’s. In current study 95% of the labourer’s are migrating because of seasonal unemployment, 98.2% labourer’s were revealed that poverty is the reason to migrate, 53.3% labourer’s said high wages in urban areas is the reason behind their migration whereas only 7.1 labourer’s given small holdings as their reason to migrate and 53.8% labourer’s were migrating due to lack of irrigation facility the above data reveals that majority of the migrants are poor, and belongs to backward communities and the main reason for migration is poverty and they start their migration on a temporary basis as it is always seasonal migration.⁹

Most of the migrants (98.51%) belonged to lower Socio-Economic status (classes III, IV & V) as per

modified B.G. Prasad classification, raises concern about health seeking practices. Majority of in-migrants lived as nuclear families (74.2%) which may point out lack of social support in times of social and health crisis in the family. Majority of in-migrants lived in over-crowded houses (86.53%) and in-adequate ventilation facilities (87.53%) which indicate their vulnerability to respiratory and skin related disorders.

Wang Guixin et al also observed that compared with the local residents, the migrants have worse living conditions, and poor housing conditions.⁶ Controlling for demographic and socioeconomic variables, the regression results confirms that living conditions is one of the important social determinants of health, and moreover, the interaction analysis shows that the impact of living conditions on health generally tend to be weaker for migrants than for local residents.¹⁰

Migrants, especially those coming from rural areas, do not necessarily enjoy job stability and may move again to different jobs, to different parts of the city and to different cities. When urban life is not suitable for them, they may abandon urban life temporarily or even forever. Whether a person feels he or she can stay at the destination for a relatively long period also affects the likeliness to buy houses or the intention to spend more money on housing.¹¹

In terms of housing quality, the respondents were asked to report on any problems they are suffering. The main ones reported included: 1) environmental problems: dampness (27.3%), cold in winter (18.2%), and noise (11.6%); and 2) lack of facilities: no heating (8.1%), no interior tap water (31.4%), no interior toilet (49.6%); no kitchen (63.4%), and no shower (89.2%). Most respondents (86.1%) lived in a permanent structure, but 32.6 percent lived on the job site.¹²

Internal migrants are excluded from the economic, cultural, social and political lives of society and are often treated as second-class citizens. The constraints faced by migrants are many: lack of formal residency rights; lack of political representation; inadequate housing; low-paid, insecure or hazardous work; limited access to state-provided services such as health and education and discrimination based on ethnicity, religion, class or gender. Still, internal migration has been accorded very low priority by the government in policy and practice, partly due to a serious knowledge gap on its extent, nature and magnitude.¹³

Migration in India is primarily of two types 'Long-term' migration, resulting in the relocation of an individual or household; and 'Short-term' or seasonal/ circular migration, involving back and forth

movement between a source and destination. Estimates of short-term migrants vary from 15 million to 100 million.^{14,15} Most short-term migrants belong to socioeconomically deprived groups, such as Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, having negligible educational attainment, limited assets and resource deficits.

Although no clear data are available, estimates suggest that child migrants constitute approximately 15 million children in India (Daniel 2011¹⁶; Smita 2011.¹⁷ About two third of the urban in-migrants uses Sanitary latrines which is surprisingly a high percentage keeping in view their socioeconomic status, but about one third (35.46%) was still going for open field defecation which again raises concern about situation of sanitation.

It was observed in the present study that 45.25% of the study population was illiterate. 4.59% were intermediate while only 1.56% were graduate and above. 58.05% of the study population was unskilled labor. Surprisingly, it was revealed that 71(78.8) children in the age group of 10-19 years were employed as unskilled labor, 1(1.11) as skilled labor and service which is against the labor law of this country that children below the age of 18 years cannot be employed in any industry.

Two fifth (41.22%) & one third (32.97%) of the females were married below and at the legal age of marriage in respectively this trend shows early age at marriage i.e. early entry into motherhood and complications in terms of morbidity & mortality.

CONCLUSION

Majority of the migrants are poor, illiterate population and belonging to backward communities. Migration is mostly for seeking job i.e. financial reason who are unable to get suitable job in their native place, they start their migration on a temporary basis. In cities, these floating populations refrains from seeking health services especially from organized public & private sector due to various reasons like poverty, illiteracy, ignorance. This population is not registered into government records due to its migratory nature.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors are thankful to the Department of Community Medicine, Himalayan Institute of Medical Sciences, Dehradun) and Swami Rama Himalayan University for permitting this research and for the help provided in conducting this study. The authors are extremely grateful to the Indian council of Medical Research, New Delhi for providing grant for this study.

REFERENCES

1. Halder AK, Gurley ES, Naheed A, Saha SK, Brooks WA, El Arifeen S, Sazzad HM, Kenah E, Luby SP. Causes of early childhood deaths in urban Dhaka, Bangladesh. *PLoS One*. 2009 Dec 3;4(12):e8145. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0008145. PubMed PMID: 19997507; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2779865.
2. Buckner B. Migration and migrant characteristics. In: 2006 Bangladesh Urban Health Survey. Dhaka and Chapel Hill: National Institute of Population Research and Training (NIPORT), MEASURE Evaluation, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research Bangladesh (ICDDR), Associates for Community and Population Research (ACPR); 2008.
3. Hussain A, Ali SM, Kvåle G. Determinants of mortality among children in the urban slums of Dhaka city, Bangladesh. *Trop Med Int Health*. 1999 Nov;4(11):758-64. PubMed PMID: 10588770.
4. Manmeet Kaur, Sukhbir Singh, Madhu Gupta, Pankaj Bahuguna, Soma Rani. Inequity in access to health services between migrants and natives of Chandigarh, India. *International Journal of Migration, Health and Social Care* 2015; 11(2):147-155.
5. Mishra S, Kusuma Yadlapalli S., Babu Bontha V.. Migration and health-care access: Barriers to access government health services by migrant tribal community living in an eastern Indian city. *Int J Med Sci Public Health* 2015;4:101-108
6. Registrar General and Census Commissioner of India, Census of India 2011, New Delhi: Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.
7. Kumari Sangita. Rural-Urban Migration In India: Determinants and Factors. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IJHSS)*2014;3(2):161-180
8. National Health Profile, Central Bureau of Health Intelligence, Director General Health Services, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Govt. of India (2011).
9. Madhu G. R, H. R. Uma. Rural To Urban Migration- Opportunities and Challenges. *International Journal of Advanced Research* 2014;2(6):389-394
10. Wang Guixin, Su Xiaoxin, Wen Ming. Urban Migrants' Living Conditions and Impact on Health Status: The Case of Shanghai[J]. *Population Research*2011;35(2):60-72.
11. Michael A. Costello. Slums and Squatter Areas as Entrepôts for Rural-Urban Migrants in a Less Developed Society. *Social Forces* 1987;66(2):427-445
12. Li, Bingqin and Duda, Mark (2011) Life considerations and the housing of rural to urban migrants: the case of Taiyuan. In: Carrillo, Beatriz and Duckett, Jane, (eds.) China's changing welfare mix. *Routledge studies on China in transition* . Routledge, Oxford, UK, pp. 151-170. ISBN 9780415597319
13. M Faetanini, R Subrahmanian - For a Better Inclusion of Internal Migrants in India - Policy Briefs. UNESCO and UNICEF, New Delhi, 2012.
14. National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO), 2010, Housing Conditions and Amenities in India 2008-09, New Delhi: Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India.
15. Deshingkar P, S Akter. Migration and Human Development in India. *Human Development Research Paper (HDRP) Series* 2009;13: 1 - 91.
16. Daniel, U., 2011, 'Update on National Workshop on Education and Protection of Migrant Children', presentation at the UNESCO-UNICEF National Workshop on Internal Migration and Human Development in India, 6-7 December 2011, New Delhi
17. Smita. Distress Seasonal Migration and its Impact on Children's Education. Project Report. Consortium for Research on Educational Access, Transitions and Equity (CREATE), Falmer, UK. 2008. (http://www.create-rpc.org/pdf_documents/PTA28.pdf)