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Chapter -I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Migration is as old as the human civilization itself. In ancient time people migrate from one place to another in search of food, shelter, hunting etc. At present migration has become a necessity to people who live in rural areas. They are forced to migrate due to lack of employment opportunities, poverty, low wage rate etc. However, people are attracted to move to urban areas in search of better opportunities, financial incentives, better education, decent life and so on. Therefore, migration occurs when the utility enjoyed in few locations becomes better than their native location. Migration changes the social, cultural and economic set up of the society at origin. The consensus about migrant households seems that the migration has improved economic welfare; including living standard, but their social status remains low due to caste hierarchy. Migration also acts as safety valve in underdeveloped areas. Migration may be conceived as a diffusion process, whereby the level of migration at any point in time is likely to be positively related to past migration by village members (Stark and Bloom, 1985).

Development and migration are closely interlinked. Income distributions of rural labour households have been changed at origin due to migration. With the inclusion of remittance, on one hand, income inequality has been decreased within the migrant of rural labour households. On the other hand, it has been increased between migrant and non-migrant households at origin. Per capita income of migrant households varied in remittance and cost for migration, including transportation and expenditure occur at migrant place.
Rural migrant labours hold fewer assets before migration, and remittance plays vital role in their assets accumulation. It also helps in sustaining the livelihoods and provides assistance for agriculture inputs. It has been evident that remittances received is being used to meet their basic needs such as food, clothing, health and house repair rather than making investment for productive purpose. Agricultural inputs and land are rarely bought by the remittances in the area of study. Migration affects the labour market at the place of origin because outmigration leads to shortage of supply of the labour. It may cause of the loss of land due to flood, reduction in the agricultural activities in the area. These circumstances make it difficult to survive for the rural poor at origin. In such a difficult time, they have only two options to survive i.e. either stay at the origin and struggle from hardship or migrate to other destinations for getting better employment opportunities. This wide gap between demand and supply increases labour cost during harvesting season.

In contrast, migration often includes longer working hours, poor living standard and hazardous working environment; social separation and poor access to basic amenities. Migration also increases workload on women in their families and they are participated in the agricultural work as laborers in case of lower caste and as overseers in case of higher caste. Their mobility increases, still it is quite restricted. Social security is a major issue for women, the chances of social violation increases in this area in the absence of migrant male members. There are different types of migration: international migration, interstate migration, inter-district migration, intra-district migration, rural to urban migration and rural to rural migration. In Saharsa district, as intra-district migration is not fulfill their requirement for livelihoods due to resource poor, socially deprived area so that internal mobility (interstate migration) is very
suitable to migrate the labours. In this area the pattern of migration are generally found rural to rural, rural to urban and both the type. But the migrants of study area have followed more diversified pattern of migrant destination. Therefore, it emerges new trend of the composite pattern of migration, such as both rural to rural and rural to urban migrations in the Saharsa according to the needs of migrants. Pattern of migration also differs on the basis of time horizon as permanent migration, semi-permanent migration, short duration migration, and seasonal or circulatory migration. However, there is difficulty for drawing boundaries between them. Therefore, this study mainly restricted to explore the impact of seasonal migration and interstate migrant labours those have close linkup or regularly connected with their family at origin.

Saharsa district of Bihar is extremely poor prone and backward district in terms of development. Social structure of rural Saharsa is based on semi feudal relationship. The semi-feudalism causes an unequal land distribution, tenancy, a mix of bounded and casual labour and indebtedness. There is lack of industrial infrastructure, employment capacity, ever increasing population, regular flood intervention and lots of agriculture land facing water logging problem. River like Kosi, Bagmati and its subsidiary branch is the main cause of the economic backwardness of this region due to regular flooded after embankment. Flood, rehabilitation and continuous migration are linked. Migration from this area mainly occurred towards Delhi, Haryana and Punjab. Apart from this, flood supports to enhance the agriculture productivity of land in some regions. Though, there is great scope for agriculture, jute based handloom industry and sericulture.

There are a number of central and state sponsored welfare schemes for rural labour, but no one is directly linked with migrant
labour. The result is that the costs of migration are borne mainly by the migrant and governments escape the responsibility of providing them with the basic needs (Deshingkar, 2004). This paradox is the main cause of less effort towards migrant support programme. However JEEVIKA has been implementing since 2007 in all the districts of Bihar to provide the service related migrant resource centre but Saharsa is left behind to implement the programme. In the present study, an attempt has been made to focus on major policies like as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, Public Distribution System (PDS), and Rastriya Swasthya Bima Yojana (RSBY) for BPL families, Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan (NBA) and National Rural Drinking Water Programme (NRDWP) for empowering the rural people in Saharsa district. MGNREGA Scheme has proved a milestone for reducing the migration rate in the state of Bihar. However, implementation of the MGNREGA scheme in the district Saharsa is very poor. Furthermore, public distribution system played very crucial role for migration decision. Public distribution system provides food security to the poor at affordable rate. But this scheme has not influenced migration due to the identification problem of the poor and its leakages. Migrant workers of this district are generally excluded from Public distribution system entitlement at both origin and destination place. Migrant and non-migrant household suffer from lack of entitlement in the schemes like Rastriya Swasthya Bima Yojana, Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan and National Rural Drinking Water Programme. This research highlights the socio-economic conditions of migrant and non-migrant rural labour households; effect of migration on rural economic development and exploring migrant supportive policies to overcome the problems related to migrant households.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Saharsa district is the most backward district of Bihar. The major problems of the region are a high incidence of poverty, unemployment, inequality and seasonal migration. As a result the high rate of temporary, short term and seasonal migration occurs in far-away places in search of work. There is also the problem with the forced migration (displacement of a large section of the population) due to regular intervention of flood. There is agrarian economy of sample area faces the shortage of labour and higher cost of farm labour due to seasonal migration.

1.3 Review of Literature

The literature related to this study is in abundance, but selected literature has been reviewed to insight the clear picture related to the migration. Different theories of migration have been analysed, after analyzing the concept of migration and its impact on socio-economic conditions of migrant households, the empirical studies, research articles, and research reports are reviewed. To find research gap, empirical literature on migration has been particularly examined.

1.3.1 Theoretical Review of Literature

Migration is continuous development process throughout the human civilization; but theorization of migration started after 19th century. At the very outset geographer Ravenstien (1885) contributed to theory of migration as formulation of “laws of migration” on the basis of empirical data. He opined that development is inbuilt with the migration, and migration occurs due to economic factors. The key preposition of law of migration is that migrants followed the short distance or in the other words volume of migration directly proportional to distance. Also migrants move in series of waves. Further, each stream of migration produces a number of counter
streams. However, this theory was not providing all dimension of migration.

Stouffer (1940) model of migration established the theory of intervening opportunity. According to him, volume of migration is not determined as much as distance and population size, but to distinguish opportunities that exist in those two places and between them.

Zipf’s (1946) model of migration based on physical concept of gravity. According to Zipf, migration is directly proportional to the size of origin and destination and expected to inversely proportional to distance.

Before 1950, migration theory reflected as mechanical explanation of migration. After the second world-war, most of undeveloped countries become too independent and moved on the path of economic development so both international as well as internal migration increased. As a result more sophisticated migration theory comes out. In this regard, this study is focused on different migration theories regarding level of analysis. The micro level of migration theories, examines how a person decision taken for migration. While aggregate migration trend, examines by macro level theories. Finally, meso level theories are in between micro and macro level, which is reflected by household participation, or community level and social network migration. Meso level of migration theory also explains both causes and perpetuation.

1.3.1.1 Micro Level Migration Theory

The most of neo-classical migration generally associated with the micro level analysis. These neo-classical migration theories point out that a rationality of individual migration decision by cost-benefit analysis. Neo-classical economist assumed that free choice, rationality and perfect information. According to them, destination of migrant predicted through wage differential and their probability of
productivity. Migration also influenced by their capability, skills, aspiration to migrate and basic structure of the labour market.

Sjaastad (1962) laid down the ‘The Human Capital Approach’ on the ground of neoclassical micro level migration theory. According to him, migration is as result of an individual rational investment decision on the basis of cost benefit analysis of expected discounted returns over migration period. Further, the positive outcome of migration increases the productivity of human capital. The Human Capital Approach, also focusing on the labour market, but same time examining the selectivity of heterogeneous migrants on the different skills. This approach mainly criticises on the ground of unrealistic assumption of no risk and asymmetric information, difficult to test empirically and ignores more structural influencing factors.

**Behaviour Model of Migration**

There are two popular behaviour models of migration Wolpert’s Stress-Threshold Model and Value Expectancy Model of migration at micro level, which bounded with individual rationality. At first, Wolpert’s Stress-Threshold Model (1965) is an extension of human capital theory in different terminology of internal migration. This model assumed that individual has capacity to estimate ex-ante utility, but not necessary to equal to the ex-post utility. An individual has need to a threshold level of utility for migration. Migration occurs, only those cases when comparative utility at destination place is higher than the current position. Current place’s utility determined by the past and future rewards whereas utility of destination place depend on the anticipated rewards. The main limitations of this model are individual rationality and perfect information about the destination.

The second important behavioural model is value expectancy behavioural model given by Crawford (1973). This model stresses that an individual take a rational decision for migration by more than
economic determinants. Main determinants of migration are expected of multiplication of values, social security and societal norms. At first, values are basically explicit goals like wealth or self-sufficiency. Further, education level of individual or households affects the expectation and values. Value expectancy model is not different from Wolpert model on subjectivity of migration choices. The main drawback of behavioural model is that over stressed on the rationality of non-economic factors and social influences in the migration decision.

Lee model (1966) has revised the Ravenstein’s laws of migration and at first to originate migration in a push-pull framework on an individual level. He examines for migration process as regarding both supply and demand side factors. According to Lee, decision on migration is determined by positive and negative factors associated with area of origin and destination, intervening obstacles such as distance, physical barriers, immigration laws, and so on; and personal factors e.g. age, sex, marital status etc. Further, he argued that flow of well defined migration streams from origin to destination place, not only due to opportunities tend to be on concentrated but also because of the reverse flow of knowledge from destination which provides the passages for later migrants. However, Lee model ignores the heterogeneity and internal stratification of society. For example, an individual decides to migrate while another person stays at the same level of condition.

Social System Theory was propounded by Hoffmann-Novotny (1981), which explains that migration is outcomes of changing structural tensions or power questions and nominal tensions or prestige questions. Social system theory is complementary of earlier micro migration theory. It adds role of social structure with remaining economic push factors. Generally, migrants want to
increase their social status at destination place, but actually tensions are transformed instead of reduced due to native political interest. At the destination, migrants have lower status whereas lower section of natives people progress with upward mobility in terms of power, social and economic empowerment.

1.3.1.2 Macro Level Migration Theory

At the macro level main determinant of migration is that demand for labour, migration laws, the effect of globalisation and worldwide social-economic-political development at origin as well destination.

Lewis (1954) and Ranis and Fei (1961) define dual labour market theory as movement of labour between traditional agriculture sector and modern sector due to differences in the supply and demand of labour and wage differential. Migration occurs until wage equalization process has completed through capital accumulation with the help of surplus labour. The other neoclassical economists also support for migration process in development activity until the surplus labour exists in the traditional agriculture sector. This model is appropriate with some limitation for underdeveloped country where disguised unemployment is commonly seen.

Harris-Todaro model (1970) argues that an individual estimate costs and benefits of economic prospective which associated with migration decision in their self-interest. This macro level model is significant for poor countries, where urban unemployment is common. However, this model suggests that migration is not totally safe and risk about unavailability of appropriate jobs even in urban destination. The positive expectation of real income differential is main cause of rural urban migration. According to him, expected income depends on the inflexible, institutionally determined urban wage, urban employment rate and costs of migration. Thus, volume of
migration increases with the increases in the urban wage rate or urban unemployment rate regarding the ceteris paribus condition. The Harris- Todaro model clarified that why a rational person migrant despite of significant urban unemployment rate. However, in the real world wage equality between rural-urban places is not possible or found by other evidence.

Priore (1979) focused on the dual labour market theory. He stresses that migration as a consequence of strong structural demand side despite of supply side factors. This theory is primarily important for developed and emerging countries. Trade cycle and demographic transition also play important role in the labour market. Further, trade cycle and demographic transition accelerates the economic dualism which reflects in the structural inflation. Where change in proportional wage of primary sector is higher than secondary particularly manufacturing sector due to high cost. For this consequence, lower wage in the secondary sector is less attractive to native worker and creates motivation for migrants of the poor economy. These migrants do not think about themselves as constituents of destination society and ready to get low status work. For example, this trend emerges in Gulf countries as mass migration flow from South Asian countries.

Mabogunje (1970) formulates system model of migration. He examines dynamic spatial process of rural urban migration trend at the macro level. According to her, aggregate migration flow of rural potential migrants affected by following factors:

1. The rural control sub-system controls outflows (e.g. family or community norms),
2. The urban control sub-system controls inflows (e.g. through employment agencies),
(3) The role of channelled feedback of destination (e.g. social-economic conditions, government policies, transport, communications and infrastructure etc.).

Migration is occurring in the open and dynamic system and incorporate changing pattern of the environment and above sub-systems.

Zelensky hypothesis of mobility transition (1971) is combination of demographic transition, process of modernisation, economic growth and mobility (vital transition). This hypothesis is one of the important dimensions of functionalist theories of social change and development which connect the empirical trends of migration. Further Zelensky hypothesis not only explores about common and speculator flow of migration in advanced societies but also focuses on precise nature of vital transition. Zelensky hypothesis is innovative with the regarding of spatio-temporal development and established the inverse relation with development. The major weakness of this hypothesis is that not consider the individual migration decisions.

1.3.1.3 Meso Level of Migration Theory

Meso level of migration theory directed by both micro and macro factor, for example- individual decision and aspiration, family influences, social and economic structure, norms of social institutes, social capital and the role of social network.

Stark and his colleagues have developed a ‘New Economics of Labour Migration’ e.g., Stark and Lvhari (1982), Stark and Bloom (1985), Stark and Wang (2002). They argue that the relevant unit of analysis in migration studies is the household rather than the individual migrant. Because of the migration decision is made collectively by household members and not separately by individuals.
Second, they suggest that migration decisions in rural, less developed areas are made not only in order to maximise income, but also to minimise risks. Their views on determinant of migration differ from classicalists, for example, NELM consider more realistic determinant of migration as comparatively restrictive determinant of classical theory of migration.

Faist, (1997) describes the meso level of migration based on the social relation and social capital in households, neighbourhoods, communities and recognized organisation. According to him, social relation implies different social capital, obligation and outcomes, for example, weak or strong exchange relationships between the different parties create social ties. Further, Massey et al. (1998) give more importance to the role of social capital in social net working theory e.g. social capital as borrowing money for migration from migrant’s neighbour. Social networking reduced the cost and risk of migration. Stark and Wang (2002) highlight the other forms of social capital in migration as the role of education or skilled migrant to unskilled migrant.

1.3.1.4 Theoretical Framework of Migration Model

In the contrast of theory of migration, Jessica Hagen-Zanker (2008) compiled the complete spectrum of economic migration theory from 1950 and onwards. His research paper “Why do people migrate? A review of the theoretical literature”, has examined the differences and complementarities between different theories of migration.
According to Jessica, migration is the temporary or permanent move of individuals or groups of people from one geographic location to another for various reasons ranging from better employment possibilities to persecution. Prior to 1980s, most of migration theories explain generally equilibrium mechanism of migration forces at aggregate data. After 1980s, migration theories focused on microeconomic models like individual motivational factor and structural community level factors to migrate. Therefore, in the present era of migration theorization, there should be making bridge between micro and macro level theories.

**1.3.2 Empirical Literature**

Lakshmanasamy (1990) stresses that rural sector positively influenced by the migration and remittance. Agro output directly or indirectly increasing through adoption of modern technology as remittance investing in the rural agriculture sector. Further the positive effects of migration are subjective and depend upon factors like
migration season or period and total duration, education levels, assets holding, social structure and social institutions.

National Commission on Rural Labour Report (1991) finds that most seasonal migrants of India belong to the marginal classes, like Scheduled Tribes and Schedule Castes. These migrants are generally young with the low levels education. The reasons behind seasonal migration are scarcity of land or lower land-to-man ratio and inter regional disparities.

Sharma (1997) finds that most of migrants belong to marginal households in which relatively younger member as heads of households with less number of workers. The major proportion of remittances spent on present consumption. After all migrants households have remain any form of savings, the first priority of investment in education rather than agriculture. However, the impact of remittance and out migration on rural poverty, savings, investments, output and income distribution is insignificant due to lesser volume of migrants and low income at the urban destinations.

According to Levitt (1998), researchers often highlight the economic impacts of migration through remittances rather than the social, cultural, ideological and political transformation of migrants. He explores the role of social remittance as new dimension of indescribable flow of knowledge, ideas, and know-how.

According to Shi (1999), in the context of growth of rural labour, migration increases the labour productivity with the efficient allocation between migrant and non-migrant workers. As rural urban migration increases, urban rural income gap becomes too narrow down. Further, rural out-migration alters the rural income inequality and despite of deterioration of income distribution, it might be improved.
According to Haan and Rogaly (2002), rural-urban gap widens due to industrialisation. The capitalist development leads to shift of rural workforce towards industrialising areas on the ground of individual and household rationality behavior.

Sorensen, et al (2002) argues that development of origin usually goes hand in-hand with migration. According to them despite of rural development of Punjab or other green fields, in-migration as well as out-migration increases from poorer Indian states. Therefore, rural development may be unjustified and poverty reduction is not as a result of migration reducing strategy.

According to Srivastava and Kumar (2003) circular migration of population and workforce of India, permanently shift towards undeveloped to developed regions or rural to urban places. Most of migrant worker engaged in the unorganised sector and contribute little bits in development.

Kapur (2004) argues that migration as an opportunity rather than a negative outcome of poverty and underdevelopment, as migrants from the south working in the north augment their skills and resources and become conduits through which human and financial capital is reinvested in their countries of origin.

McKenzie and Rapoport (2004), note that wealth has a non-linear effect on migration and examines overall impact of migration on inequality. They established the U-shaped relationship between emigration and inequality on the evidence from Mexico. According to them, the direct effect of remittances and the spillover effects of remittances on individual production and household labour supply. The general equilibrium effects of consumption and production of different goods and services spill over by other community members due to multiplier effects of remittance.
According to Black et al (2005), mutual causality between migration and inequality varies across space, both between and within different continents. They argue that the specific terms between migration and inequality in sending villages will depend on the initial distribution of wealth. As wealth increases, the maximum number of migrants a given household can afford increases, but the optimal number decreases. On the other hand increases in the domestic production, opportunity cost of migration but reduces in the cost of migration due to relation in the credit constraint. At first migration rate will increase the decrease with wealth which is called in the aggregate terms as ‘migration hump’.

Sharma (2005) finds that the increased migration of labour from the Bihar has contributed its own share to changing the rural labour markets and social structure. It is significant that even the upper castes, in the wake of stagnation in agriculture, have migrated in large numbers in search of employment. He also noted that a significant proportion of land-owning population had started to migrate. Among the incentives for migration his study shows that apart from economic factors, social factors such as breaking out of the caste taboo of the villages is an important reason. Another reason that he noted was that while it is not possible for persons from upper castes to take up manual work in the villages they can take up any kind of work in the urban areas where they are not visible to their neighbours in the villages.

According to Haan (2006), migration from well functioning integrated labour market would be remove the disparities and equalization of development. He also highlights the positive and negative effect of remittance regarding form of migration, condition for use of remittances and returning migrants.
Raghuram (2009) points out that migration research often views mobility as a one-way process that mechanically connects migrant sending and migrant receiving countries while studies of remittances too concentrate on unidirectional flows of resources. Moreover, remittance research is often carried out in isolation from migration studies, as if these two kinds of flows (of people and resources) were not interlinked processes.

In the context of internal migrants, especially seasonal and circular migrants, Deshingkar and Farrington (2009) finds that migrants constitute a floating population, as they alternate between living at their source and destination locations, and in turn lose access to social protection benefits linked to the place of residence. There remains no concerted strategy to ensure portability of entitlements for migrants.

Deshingkar and Akter (2009) argue that migration may provide an opportunity to break out caste divisions and restrictive social norms and work with dignity and freedom at the destination.

According to Srivastava (2011), migration is now viewed as a finite stage in the lifecycle of the household: as sons approach an age where they can be sent away to earn, the head of the household stays in the village to look after the farm and other enterprises.

Bhagat (2011) highlights the role of social remittance in the internal migration context. According to him, social remittance improves the skills, awareness and knowledge capacity of migrants. In the native place, due to social remittance structure of agrarian economy alter with flow of innovative ideas, changes in the taste preference, not accepted worse employment conditions and semi-feudal relationship.

Rodgers, G. and Rodgers, J. (2011) note that pattern of migration has important changes taking place between 1999 and 2008-
09 and follow long term migration and diversified urban destination instead of short term seasonal migration. Though, entire households are not permanently moved. In the recent year, child labour migration (Between ages of 10 to 14) increased towards Moradabad, Delhi, and Firozabad to work in factories of bangles, toys, carpets or steel pots or dishes. The more interesting development due to migration as hike of agriculture wage rate.

Kundu, Ray and Saraswati (2012) find that migration and urbanisation patterns in recent decades, which show a noticeably declining trend. According to them, migration process has inbuilt screening system, migrants address with the comparatively higher economic and social strata. Therefore, in the contrast of poverty induced migration has less importance. At the same movement, in a proposal to invitation for private capital, urban destination become less accommodating to the poor, restricting their entry and thereby increasing rural-urban economic inequalities.

According to Keshri and Bhagat (2012), overall, temporary and seasonal migration declines with better economic and educational status. In rural areas, those with increasing incomes become less prone to migrate temporarily. Social factors play a critical role in migration decisions. Those belonging to STs have a higher chance of migrating seasonally than people in any other social group.

Dewan (2013) studied the Kosi flood disaster on migrant children of Bihar and find that mental health level of non-migrant sample was higher than that of migrant children in respect of religion, socio-economic status and gender. The motivation level of migrant children compared to non- migrants were found higher in respect of religion, socio-economic status and gender.
1.4 Research Gap

Literature review reflects that there is a need to establish more clarity on the effect of migration on development of areas at origin, including agriculture. There is no any study found as the effects of migration and extent of income inequality at origin as a sample area (i.e. rural Saharsa), even in areas with long traditions of out-migration.

1.5 Research Questions

(1) Whether migration transforms the socio-economic structure of rural society?
(2) Is rural to rural migration (providing) better job opportunity than rural to urban migration or mixed of both?
(3) Is there any discrimination between migrant and non-migrant households in the social protection schemes?

1.6 Objectives of the Study

(1) To examine the socio-economic status of migrant and non-migrant rural labour household at origin.
(2) To calculate the income and wage inequality between migrant and non-migrant household of rural labour.
(3) To examine the effect of social protection schemes on migrants and non-migrant households at origin.

1.7 Research Methodology

1.7.1 The Area and Purpose of Study

District Saharsa of Bihar is purposely selected as the area of study. The reason behind such a selection, there is a high incidence of poverty found in this district. The major problems of the districts are seasonal and lagging agricultural sector, unavailability of employment opportunities in the lean season and a high rate of temporary and seasonal out migration to other places in search of work.
1.7.2 **Methods of Study and Data Sources**

The present study is a quantitative and analytical research method based on primary data and secondary information collected from reliable sources like Census report of 2001 and 2011, reports of Rural Development Department (GOI), reports of Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Bihar, published and un-published research materials.

1.7.3 **Sample Design**

This study is based on primary data collected from five migration prone villages of different block of Saharsa district. Villages are located far away from district headquarter, which support our purpose. A primary survey method conducted with the help of a well-designed schedule of questionnaire and focused group discussion.

**Table No. 1.1 Sample area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Panchayat</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Distance and direction from Headquarter of district</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banma Itahari</td>
<td>Itahari</td>
<td>Ithari</td>
<td>22 K. M. South-East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahishi</td>
<td>Telhar</td>
<td>Lakhani</td>
<td>25 K.M. West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sattar Kattiya</td>
<td>Rakiya</td>
<td>Mokana</td>
<td>23 K.M. North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonbarasa</td>
<td>Bargoan</td>
<td>Bargoan</td>
<td>22 K.M. East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simri Bakhtiapur</td>
<td>Mohammadpur</td>
<td>Bhagdeva</td>
<td>24 K.M. South-West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Designed by author

A Quota sampling technique has used to select households for a detailed survey. Sample size of the study covered total of 100
households in which 20-20 households taken from each sample village. Further, we divide above 20 households as two parts, in the first 10 households taken as migrants and remaining 10 households from non-migrant households of rural labour.

At first, classified the migrant as well non-migrant rural labour households then gathering different information through directly with the respondents and indirect observations. Household consider as migrant household if at least one member migrated for livelihoods more than four months in each years. If classified households did not fulfill the prescribed criteria then it was replaced by other households. A single focused group discussion carried out in each of sample villages on the social and economic issues like caste dominant system, political influences and wage level of different sector in past eight to nine years.

1.7.4 Model Specification

The proposed objective of Income inequality measured by with the help of Gini Coefficient. Gini Coefficient is a measure of statistical dispersion most prominently used as a measure of inequality of income distribution or inequality of wealth distribution. It measures the ratio of the area between the Lorenz curve and the equidistribution line to the area of maximum concentration. It is defined as a ratio with values 0 and 1. A low Gini Coefficient indicates more equal income or wealth distribution, while a high Gini Coefficient indicates more unequal distribution. O corresponds to perfect equality and 1 corresponds to perfect inequality. Gini Coefficient requires that no one has a negative net income or wealth.

If the Lorenz curve is represented by the function

\[ Y = L(X) \], then

\[ G = 1 - 2 \int_{0}^{1} L(X) dX \]
For a population uniform on the values $Y_i$, $i = 1$ to $n$ indexed in non-decreasing order ($Y_i \leq Y_{i+1}$)

$$G = \frac{1}{n} \left[ \frac{n+1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (n+1-i)Y_i \right]$$

1.7.4.1 Procedure to Calculation the Gini Coefficient

1. The starting point is to sort out the income distribution by income level.
2. Calculate the cumulative income distribution.
3. We can obtain the cumulative proportion of income ($q_i$) by dividing each cumulative income by total income.
4. Find the cumulative proportion of population ($p_i$) for this purpose, we must rank individuals in an increasing with the lowest income then dividing by $n$.
5. We must compute the area of polygons $Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, \ldots, Z_n$. By first one is a triangle and the rest of trapezium (by applying above formula).

Area below the Lorenz curve is denoted by $Z$
Area of triangle $Z_1 = p_1$ (base) $q_1$ (height) / 2
Area of each trapezium is given by,
Zi = 1/2 (qi – qi-1) [base] (pi – pi-1)
As p0 = q0 = 0
The sum of these areas,
\[ Z = \sum_{n=1}^{n} Zi = \sum_{n=1}^{n} [(qi + qi - 1)(pi – pi - 1)] \]
Since, concentration area = 1/2 – Z
Then, Gini coefficient = 1/2 - Z / ½, Hence, we get, G = 1 -2 Z.

1.7.5 Tools and Techniques used in the Study
In order to get entry of data, coding and decoding of data, and making statistical analysis, different software package such as EXCEL and SPSS 20.0 version has been used in the study. Cross tabulation, simple per cent and graphical technique have used for data presentation.

1.8 Significance of the Study
This study will improve the understanding of socio-economic transformation, and their effects at origin by exploration of comprehensive databases on migration of caste, gender, occupation, migration duration, assets holding, debt level and their diversified investment strategy. It will also help in determining different pattern of migration in the context of remittance send to their families at origin and saving, working conditions, health and other basic facility at different destination. This study also highlights the clarity about the how far income and wage inequality between migrant and non-migrant household increase or decrease on the consequence of migration. It provides the theoretical and empirical evidence for role of welfare schemes on migration decision. Therefore, it would be helpful for policy makers for different task of migrant support strategy.

1.9 Limitation of the Study
(1) This study has not highlighted the statistics and consequence of permanent migrant households. It required to more intensive study to identification and social and economic contribution towards their native place.

(2) This study primarily focuses on the short term and seasonal migration and covers only those migrant households who connected with their families and close linkup between migrant place and origin.

(3) This study has not considered migration due to marriage, migration within the state (interstate migration) and intra-district migration.

(4) This study has also not covered the skilled rural labours in the organized sector.

(5) This study has not shown the impact of agriculture production or net sown area due to consequence of migration.

1.10 Structure of Chapter Plan

1. The first chapter deals with the introduction and background of migration. It focuses on theoretical and empirical literature review of various studies, which has been conducted on migration under development studies. Further, this chapter designed the research methodology for research problems and objectives of the study.

2. The second chapter has been concentrated on the socio-economic structure of migrant rural labour households at origin. It distinguished the social status of migrant and non-migrant household on the basis of age, gender and marital status of head, religion and caste structure, family size and education level. Then, economic status of migrant and non-migrant households distinguished on the basis of employment and occupation structure, types of housing, land holding
pattern, distribution of assets (other than land), distribution of per capita income (excluding remittance) and distribution of debts.

3. The third chapter explores the cause of migration, pattern of migration and economic development at origin. This chapter highlights the effects of migration on income as well wage inequality between migrant and non-migrant households, role of remittance as an investment strategy of the individual, and change in the labour market. At last, this chapter also focuses on the working and health condition at the destination according to different pattern of migration.

4. The fourth chapter has examined the different social protection policy for migrant labour at origin as well destination.

5. The fifth chapter explains conclusion and suggestions.

*****
Chapter -II
SOCIO ECONOMIC PROFILE OF MIGRANT AND NON-MIGRANT HOUSEHOLDS OF DISTRICT SAHARSA

2.1 Introduction

Saharsa district had a long trend of seasonal labour migration. The impact of seasonal migration is easily visible when it is compared to socio-economic status of migrant rural labour to non-migrant rural labour households. Migration influenced the caste dominancy society, land distribution pattern at some extent, and increased their self-respect. Now the socio-political scenario is less discriminate against backward caste of both migrant and non-migrant rural labour households. This chapter discusses the socio-economic profile of migrant and non migrant rural labour, which is divided into two parts. At first, this chapter focuses on demographic features, workforce structure (rural-urban division) and the physical environment of Saharsa. Economic backwardness of this region is due to uneven land distribution, which compromises semi-feudal society, uncast water lodged land and agro ecology problem- such as regular interval of floods on the agricultural land.

The second part of the chapter examines the social and economic status of migrant and non-migrant labour households of rural Saharsa on the basis of primary survey. This study is also focused on the effect of migration regarding the transformation of the socio-economic set up of society at origin. For this purpose, the social and economic status of both the type of households examined on the basis of the factors like age, gender and marital status of head, religion
& caste structure, educational attainment, occupation of head & employment, structure housing condition, distribution of homestead land, agriculture land and debt. The common characteristic of most populated section of migrant labour reflected by their young age between 31 to 45, low level of education, big family size and high level of aspiration horizon. These social and economic variables also played important role in the migration decision. This study has been found that seasonal migrant household’s living standard is relative higher than non-migrant households. Though, more poor prone migrant households living condition has not significantly changed and their living condition remains worse and face fewer corporations from their villagers.

2.2 Background of Saharsa District

Saharsa district is economically backward region of Bihar. In the past, Saharsa was part of the historical state of Mithila. The district Saharsa lies between 25º 35’ to 26º 04' north latitudes and 86º 18’ to 86º 52' east longitudes. The total area of Saharsa district is 1661.30 sq. km. urban area is 19.10 sq. km and rest rural area is 1642.20 sq.km.

2.2.1 Demographic Feature

According to Census 2011, the total population of Saharsa about 18,97,102, which constitute 1.82 percent population of the state. The proportion of male and female in total population of district Saharsa is 52.32 percent, 47.68 percent respectively, while the state has share of 52.10 percent and 47.90 percent respectively. Sex ratio of Saharsa district is 906 which are below from state sex ratio 916. Nearly, 91.82 percent population of Saharsa district belongs to rural areas and rest, 8.18 percent of the population live in urban areas. This figure of rural-urban proportion of the population is greater than the state’s share, which is 88.70 percent and 11.30 percent respectively.
### Table No. 2.1: Demographic Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Saharsa</th>
<th>Bihar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>18,97,102</td>
<td>10,38,04,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9,95,502 (52.32)</td>
<td>5,41,85,347 (52.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9,01,600 (47.68)</td>
<td>4,96,19,290 (47.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sex Ratio</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>17,41,927 (91.82)</td>
<td>9,20,75,028 (88.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1,55,175 (8.18)</td>
<td>1,17,29,609 (11.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Decadal growth Percentage</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td>25.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Density of Population (per. sq.km)</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>8,29,206 (54.57)</td>
<td>5,43,90,254 (63.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,21,560 (65.22)</td>
<td>3,27,11,975 (73.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,07,646 (42.73)</td>
<td>2,16,78,279 (53.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Census 2011*

*Note: Parentheses Value is in percentage*

Previous decadal growth rate (in terms of per cent 25.79) of Saharsa district was approx equal to state decadal growth rate (25.07). Density of Saharsa constitutes 1125 per sq. km which is greater than the density of Bihar (1102). The district Saharsa is educationally backward. In the contrast of literacy rate, Saharsa (54.57) has far below than the literacy rate of Bihar (63.82). The literacy rate of male
(65.22) is higher than the literacy rate of female (42.73) in Saharsa due to the rigid social institution.

2.2.2 Workforce Structure

The district Saharsa is primarily agriculture dominated society. Therefore, majority of workforce is engaged in agriculture and its allied activities. The total working population of district Saharsa is 6,49,898 of which 93.56 percent belongs to rural economy and only 6.44 percent workers exhaust in the urban area that is 12,50,763. The total worker divided in two parts, main worker and marginal worker.

**Table No. 2.2: Distribution of Workers by Broad Categories - Saharsa, 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of worker</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Worker Population</td>
<td>6,49,898</td>
<td>6,08,097</td>
<td>41,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Working Population</td>
<td>3,63,326</td>
<td>3,31,267</td>
<td>32,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Cultivator Population</td>
<td>1,18,840</td>
<td>1,17,390</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Agricultural Labourers Population</td>
<td>1,55,772</td>
<td>1,51,803</td>
<td>3,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Household Industries Population</td>
<td>8,365</td>
<td>7,407</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Other Workers Population</td>
<td>80,349</td>
<td>54,667</td>
<td>25,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginal Worker Population</th>
<th>2,86,572</th>
<th>2,76,830</th>
<th>9,742</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Cultivator Population</td>
<td>45,760</td>
<td>45,256</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Agriculture Labourers Population</td>
<td>2,01,061</td>
<td>1,97,919</td>
<td>3,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Household Industries Population</td>
<td>10,286</td>
<td>9,577</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Other Workers Population</td>
<td>29,465</td>
<td>24,078</td>
<td>5,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Working Population</td>
<td>12,50,763</td>
<td>11,36,024</td>
<td>1,14,739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to census 2001, main worker defined as those workers, who had worked for the major part of the reference period (i.e. 6 months or more) are termed as Main Workers and marginal worker as those workers who had not worked for the major part of the reference period (i.e. less than 6 months) are termed as marginal workers. Distribution of main and marginal worker composed in to four major groups, cultivator population agriculture labour populations, household industries population and other worker population. Among the total main worker population share of cultivator population, agriculture labour population, household industries population and other worker population are 33, 43, 2 and 22 percent respectively. Further, rural main worker distributed in cultivator population, agriculture labour population, household industries population and other worker populations are 35, 46, 2 and 17 percent respectively. In the rural main worker population share of
cultivator population, agriculture labour population, household industries population and other worker population are 16, 70, 4 and 10 percent respectively. Among the rural marginal worker population share of cultivator population, agriculture, labor population, household industries population and other worker population 16, 72, 3 and 9 percent respectively. Thus there is similarity between participation in cultivation, agriculture labour population, household industries and other worker population.

2.2.3 Physical Environment

Climate of Saharsa district is dry, hot, humid in summer and cold in winter. The district is formed by the alluvial and alluvium plain. The slope of the district is normally from north to south with a slight inclination eastward. There are numerous channels of the Kosi River. Its geological shape is like bowl type. Though, there are few embankments but in the rainy season the Kosi River has caused more damage by flood. Therefore, mass level of household’s displacement occurs at regular interval. The previous worst flood comes in to 2008 which affect the badly socio-economic setup of the entire Kosi basin. However, there are some positive impact of the normal flood on fishing and agriculture for maize, jute, paddy and makhana in lower parts of the district. Normal floods provide productive land and reduced the cost of fertilizer. The district has a large number of marshes, which scattered throughout the entire area. They mostly occurred on the bank side of the river. A number of marshes have now been cultivated for some crop like makhana, singhara and jute. The wetland statistics of the district are given in Table 2.3. As per National Wetland Atlas (Bihar), the total wetland area in the Saharsa district is 12,086 hectares including 223 small wetlands having an area less than 2.25 ha which comprises the highest extent of wetland about 10 percent of the geographical area of the district.
Table No. 2.3: Area Estimates of Wetlands in Saharsa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Wetland Category</th>
<th>Number of Wetlands</th>
<th>Total Wetland area</th>
<th>Percent of wetland area</th>
<th>Open Water (Area in ha)</th>
<th>Post-monsoon area</th>
<th>Pre-monsoon area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inland Wetlands – Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lakes/Ponds</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ox-bow lakes/Cut-off meanders</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High altitude wetlands</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Riverine wetlands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Waterlogged</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>River/Stream</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8,502</td>
<td>70.35</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>3,881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inland Wetlands - Man-made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reservoirs/Barrages</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tanks/Ponds</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Waterlogged</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Salt pans</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,863</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,202</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,125</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands (&lt;2.25 ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>223</strong></td>
<td><strong>223</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.85</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,086</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,202</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,125</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Wetland Atlas, Bihar, 2010
The rivers/streams contribute almost 70 percent of wetland extent of the district, which occupied for 8,502 ha. The major wetland category of the district is naturally waterlogged (2,501 ha), lakes/ponds (546 ha) and oxbow lakes/cutoff meanders (241 ha). Water spread is 7,202 ha in post-monsoon, which is decreased 43 percent in pre-monsoon (4,125 ha).

2.2.4 Rainfall in the District

The major portion of the net area sown or cultivable land is non-irrigated. Therefore, rain is crucial for agriculture production. In the recent year rain cycle in the entire belt of Kosi basin becomes too volatile. Table 2.4 shows that rainfall is very uneven since 2007 due to climate change. The trend of average number of rainy days in a year was fluctuating from 51.6 days to 48.2 days. In the contrast of actual rainfall there is secular distortion. It is decreased 1270.7 mm to 392.7 mm from 2007 to 2010. The year 2010 is very bad for agriculture production due to average number of rainy days and actual rainfall fall at very low level respectively 33.0 days and 392.7 mm. However the year 2011 shows that improvement in terms of average rainy days, but actual level of rainfall (800.8 mm) was not satisfactory.

Table No. 2.4: Distribution of Rainfall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average No. of rainy days</th>
<th>Actual rainfall in mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>1270.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>1146.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>896.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>392.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>800.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.5 Land use Pattern

The total geographical area of district Saharsa is 1,64,559 Ha. Geographical area has been classified according to ten different uses of land during 2008-09 which is presented in Table No. 2.5.

#### Table No. 2.5: Land use Pattern of Saharsa (2008-09)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Land use pattern of the district (2008-09)</th>
<th>Area (‘000 Ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Geographical area</td>
<td>164.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Net area sown/Cultivable area</td>
<td>100.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Area sown more than once</td>
<td>75.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gross sown area</td>
<td>176.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total net irrigated area</td>
<td>50.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land Area</td>
<td>21.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Permanent Water use Area</td>
<td>4.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Temporary Water use Area</td>
<td>2.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Total non-agriculture land</td>
<td>28.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Permanent pastures and grazing land</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cultivable wasteland</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Barren and uncultivable land</td>
<td>10.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Land under Misc. Tree crops and groves</td>
<td>4.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Current fallow</td>
<td>14.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fallow land Other than current</td>
<td>3.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>Total uncultured land (total of 3+7+8+9+10)</td>
<td><strong>63.841</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total cultivated land and total uncultured land during 2008-09 is respectively 1,00,718 Ha and 63,841 Ha. The share of the total net irrigated area in the net area had sown about 49.78 percent. The detail statistics of land use pattern of the district is given in table number 2.5.

(i) **Net Area Sown**

Net area sown defined as the total area sown under first crop during the year. The area cultivated during any part of the agricultural year should come under net area sown. Area sown more than ones will be counted only once for the net area sown. Out of 1,64,559 Ha of total geographical area 1,00,718 Ha of land constituting 61.20 percent is cultivated once with various crops during the year 2008-09.

(ii) **Area Sown More than Once**

This represents the difference between the gross area sown under all crops and the net area sown during the agricultural year. The area had sown more than once during 2008-09 is 75,817 Ha.

(iii) **Total Cropped Area (Gross Area Sown)**

The gross area sown defined as the total area cultivated under all food and non-food crops, including the area sown more than once during the year 2008-09. According to this concept the area under various crops in the same plot can be more than the actual area. The gross area sown during 2008-09 was 1,76,535 Ha.

(iv) **Land Cropped Area (Gross Area Sown)**

The land put to use for purposes other than agriculture, such as building, pathways, roads, bus stands, railways etc. is brought under this category. Area under this classification is 28,516 Ha accounting for 17.32 percent of the geographical area. Further non agricultural land divided into a land area and water use area. The area of land which is not used for agriculture purpose is 21,517 Ha. Water use area is the land where water is at/near the surface and stands for most part
of the year. It is generally found in the lower area and Kosi embankment region. The water use area also divided into permanent use (4,780 Ha) and temporary water use area (2,219 Ha).

(v) Permanent Pastures and other Grazing Land

All grazing lands considered as permanent pastures and other grazing lands, whether they are permanent pastures or meadows. An extent of 1,150 Ha which is only 0.006 percent of the geographical area of the Saharsa falls under this category.

(vi) Cultivable Waste

Report on Agricultural Statistics 2009-10, defined cultivable land as land available for cultivation, but not taken up for cultivation or abandoned after a few years for one reason or the other. Such lands may be either fallow or covered with shrubs or jungles, which are not put to any use. They may be assessed or non-assessed and may lie in isolated blocks or within cultivated holdings. Lands once cultivated, but remaining uncultivated for five years or more in succession shall also be included in this category. The total area under cultivable waste is 475 Ha i.e., 0.002 percent of the total geographical area of Saharsa.

(vii) Barren and Uncultivable Land

Report on Agricultural Statistics 2009-10, defined barren and uncultivable Land as that land which cannot be brought under cultivation unless at a high cost, whether such land is in isolated blocks or within cultivated holdings, such as mountains, deserts, hills etc. are classified as barren and uncultivable land. The total barren and uncultivable land is 10,793 Ha which represents 0.06 percent of the total geographical area of Saharsa.

(viii) Land under Miscellaneous Tree Crops

Land under miscellaneous tree crops reflect that all cultivable lands, which is not included under net area sown, but is put to some agricultural are coming under this category. The total area of the Land
under miscellaneous tree crops is 4,308 Ha which represents 0.025 percent of the total geographical area of Saharsa.

(ix) Fallow other than Current Fallow

Land which was taken up for cultivation, but have been temporarily put off cultivation for a period of not less than one year but not more than five years due to abject poverty of the cultivators, inadequate supply of water, silting of canals and rivers etc. are treated as other fallow land. The total area under other fallow land accounts 3,831 Ha which is 0.023 percent of the total geographical area.

(x) Current Fallow Land

Land that is kept fallow off out of the net area sown during the previous year is recognized as current fallow for the reporting year. The area under this category during 2008-09 was 14,758 Ha, which is 0.088 percent of the total geographical area.

2.2.6 Important Agriculture Crops

Agricultural crops of the district are broadly classified into five categories that are major field crops, horticulture crops- fruits, horticulture crops-vegetable, medical aromatic crops and fodder crops. The main food crop in the district is rice and wheat. Crops are also divided according to season as Kharrif and Rabi. DAO, Saharsa reveal that the major field crops consist of rice, maize, wheat, lentils/pulses and mustard, which is produced under area of respectively 27940, 7941, 4969, 1427 and 1682 Ha. The average production and productivity from 2004 to 2008-09, with the respect of rice, wheat, maize (Rabi) and maize (Kharrif) respectively at 47008 tons &1685 kg/ha, 108082 ton & 2190 kg/ha, 19095 tons & 2512 kg/ha and 837ton and 809 kg/ha. Hence, we can say that there is great potential of agriculture of maize in Rabi season as its productivity is highest among major field crops and less cultivated area. The major portion of horticulture crops-fruits produced under the area of 2581, 292, 277,
357 and 800 Ha for respectively mango, guava, banana, litchi and makhana. The district has lots of waterlogged area so great scope of agriculture of makhana. Which is now regarded as luxury dry fruit in metro city therefore a bright opportunity for its trade.

2.3 Social Status of Migrant and Non-migrant Households

The social status of migrant and non-migrant rural labour households of the study area is changing with their economic development. Social status determined by the age, gender, marital status of head, caste structure of households, family size and education profile of households.

Table No. 2.6: Age, Gender and Martial Status of Head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-Migrant Household</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 to 30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60 Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Head</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-Migrant Household</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status of Head</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-Migrant Household</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow/Widowed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*
2.3.1 Age of Head

Age is one of the important factors in migration decision. It also differentiates the social status of rural labour households on the basis of age group of head of households. At the origin society, relatively older age of head of households has higher social respect than relative less age of the head. Age structure of head of household of the workforce is divided into four parts as 15 to 30, 31 to 45, and 46 to 60 and above 60 years. The second age group (31 to 45 years) constitutes 34 percent as a major proportion of head of the total workforce. Then it comes to share of third age group (46 to 60 years) 27 percent, first age group (15 to 30 years) 22 percent and fourth age group (above 60 years) 17 percent respectively. The age structure of head of migrant and non-migrant households constitutes as first age group have 38 and 6 percent, the second age group have 42 and 26 percent, the third age group have 14 and 40 percent and fourth age group have 6 and 28 percent person respectively. Table 2.6 shows reveals that head of migrant households are relatively younger than the head of non-migrant households. Therefore, the social status of the non-migrant rural labour households is higher than migrant households due to the presence of older head.

2.3.2 Gender and Martial Status of Head

The society of the research area is paternal based; therefore, the majority of head of household belongs to male gender, which is 94 percent of the sample population. In the migrant household no female head was found. Whereas, in the case of non-migrant households belongs to 88 and 12 percent of male and female head respectively. The head of household generally believes in marriage system. Out of 100 households 83 engages with married life. In the context of married status, 86 percent head of non-migrant have married life which is slightly higher than 80 percent of married head of migrant
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household. No head of non-migrant was found unmarried while 4 percent of head of migrant household were unmarried. Out of 100 households 15 head becomes to widow/widowed and in which 16 percent and 14 percent head of migrant and non-migrant household respectively are widowed.

Table 2.6 shows that gender or marital status does not differentiate the social status of migrant and non-migrant rural labour households. During the field survey, it also observed that the female of migrant households is more prone to victim of criminal offences. The social security concern of the female is big issues in the migration period, particularly absent of migrant male members of respective rural labour households.

2.3.3 Religion Structure

Table No. 2.7: Religion and Caste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-Migrant Household</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Caste Structure**   |                   |                       |       |
| Mahadalit (SC)        | 16                | 16                    | 16    |
| Dalit (SC)            | 14                | 22                    | 18    |
| Schedule Tribe        | 2                 | 2                     | 2     |
| OBC-I                 | 22                | 24                    | 23    |
| OBC-II                | 34                | 24                    | 29    |
| General               | 12                | 12                    | 12    |
| **Total**             | **100**           | **100**               | **100** |

Source: Field Survey, 2013
The sample area is Hindu dominated population, 91 per cent of the total sample population is Hindu in which 92 and 90 per cent of migrant and non-migrant household respectively compromise as Hindu. The rest of the population belongs to Muslim religion. The religion of sample not reveals any significant differences in migrant and non-migrant household therefore it has not influenced the migration decision.

2.3.4 Caste Structure

Government of Bihar developed a major instrument for measurement of severity of caste structure. In this regard, Schedule Caste further divided in to Mahadalit and Dalit (Schedule Caste). Other backward class is categorized in to Annexure I (i.e. Extreme backward class) and Annexure II. Therefore, this study explores the role of caste in the migration process and reference to their social status. Table 2.7 reflects that the proportion of caste of total population in descending order as OBC-II, OBC-I, Dalit, Mahadalit, General then Schedule Tribes are 29, 23, 18, 16, 12 and 2 percent respectively. At the aggregate level, 52 percent of total households, while 56 and 48 percent of migrant and non migrant households respectively belongs to OBC. At the aggregate level, 34 per cent of total households and among them 30 and 38 percent of migrant and non migrant households respectively belongs to Schedule Caste (Mahadalit and Dalit). Among the migrant and non-migrant household, there is a significant difference in terms of proportion of Dalit, OBC-I and OBC-II population. In the migrant household, the proportion of OBC-II, OBC-me and Dalit is 34, 22 and 14 percent respectively, while in the non-migrant, proportion of OBC-II, OBC-I and Dalit is 24, 24 and 22 percent respectively. The OBC-II (high concentration of Yadav caste) has greater mobility power and higher proportion of the total workforce. Dalit constitutes 22 percent of non-
migrant household, which is higher than migrant households (14 percent). Mahadalit constitutes 16 percent in each of migrant and non-migrant households. General or forward caste is also participating in low economic activity at origin and migrant place its share in both migrant and non-migrant household as 12 percent. The proportion of Schedule Tribes is low (2 percent in both migrant and non migrant household) due to lower population in rural area.

The social status of both types of households in the rural society is low, but forward and OBC (particularly Yadav and Kurmy) caste of non-migrant households have comparative higher social status than SC/ST or backward caste (OBC- I) of migrant households. Though labour is mainly belongs to backward caste in both types of households and less proportion of the forward caste. Therefore on the ground of SC/ST or Backward caste at most all labour households have lower status without bifurcation of migrant or non-migrant households. Caste factor plays a leading role in determining their social status even in some cases rising economic level of migrant households strike on the caste supremacy.

2.3.5 Family Size

Generally backward region is associated with the big family size due to poverty, joint family structure, and higher fertility rate, unawareness of education, rigidity of spiritual sentiments and unwillingness of family planning. The pragmatic reason behind the big family size is that it covers the social protection for local bad elements. However, most of respondent favors reducing their family size for the next generation.

Table 2.8 shows that family size in the both migrant as well as non migrant households is big. Only 4 per cent of non-migrant household have family size below 3 members and no anyone migrant household fall under this group. On average out of 100 households 30
falls under family size consists of 3 to 5 members, in which 32 and 28 family belongs to migrant and non-migrant households respectively.

### Table No. 2.8: Family Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Family Member</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-migrant Household</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

The family size consists of 6 to 8 members has a higher frequency than another group of family size, on average out of 100 households, 38 falls under this group, in which 34 and 42 per cent of family belongs to migrant and non-migrant households respectively. In the family size consists of 9 to 10 members, 10 and 7 families belong to migrant and non-migrant households respectively. On average out of 100 households 13 falls under a very big family size of above 10 members, in which 7 and 6 families belong to migrant and non-migrant households respectively. The average family size in both migrant and non-migrant households is 6.

From the above table it is clear that family size of migrant households is relatively bigger than non migrant households. It reflects that big family size initiates the migration. It also notice that big family of migrant households not considered as economic burden, but providing more income as migrating more than one member. Despite of big family size, social status of migrant households is lower
than non-migrant households due to a higher age group of male member often absent in the village.

2.3.6 Education Profile of Households

In the modern era education is crucial for all on the ground of social, moral and economic value. Education creates big differences of remuneration between educated and non-educated labour force.

Table No. 2.9: Education Level of Head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level of Head</th>
<th>Migrant Labour</th>
<th>Non-migrant Labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below primary level</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary level</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher secondary level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above higher secondary level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2013

At first under the education profile, it examined the education level of head of migrant and non-migrant households then focus on educational attainment of respective households. Table No. 2.9 shows that 40 percent of migrant labours are illiterate whereas 28 percent of non migrant labours are illiterate. Gap between migrant and non migrant labour is less regarding below the primary level that is 36 and 30 percent respectively. Primary and above the primary level, non-migrant labours have relatively higher proportion in terms of educated labour than migrant labours. Only 10 and 8 percent of migrant labours have primary and middle level education, whereas 20 and 12 percent of non-migrant labours have respectively. Secondary level education
of both migrant and non-migrant labours is low and covering only 4 percent. In terms of higher secondary level, non migrant labours (4 percent) are comparatively better than the migrant labours (2 percent). There is no migrant labour having education above the highest secondary level, whereas 2 percent in the case of non-migrant labours. This study finds that the education level of head of migrant households is comparative lower than non-migrant households. Generally, it has believed that education initiates the migration for higher remuneration. But demand for seasonal migrant labours is not affected by education level in the rural agriculture or urban construction sector or others where a lower level of skills is required.

**Table No. 2.10: Education Achievement of Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Achievement</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-migrant Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total educated population of sample</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total uneducated population (above 14 years) of sample</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population of sample</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy rate&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>42.27</td>
<td>43.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiteracy rate (above 14 years)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28.27</td>
<td>26.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Calculated by author from field survey, 2013*

---

1 Literacy rate = Total educated population / Total population size*100 [All members above 6 years regarded as the literate who write and read frequently].

2 Illiteracy rate = Total uneducated population / Total population size*100 [Under the illiteracy rate, all illiterate members above 14 year have covered].
The educational attainment of migrant and non-migrant households has examined by the literacy and illiteracy rate. This study finds that literacy rate of non-migrant households (43.19) is marginally higher than migrant households (42.27). However, the literacy rate of Saharsa (54.57, Census, 2011) is higher than these rural labour households. On the other hand illiteracy rate of migrant households (28.27) is higher than migrant households (26.31). In this way, this study finds that both types of households suffer from educational backwardness. The reason behind the high rate of illiteracy is high incidence of poverty and less infrastructure of education in the rural origin. In the recent era, enrollment in elementary education is increasing due to right to education and universalisation of elementary education by Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. In this regard, Srivastava (2011) and showed that in India children accompanying seasonal and circular internal migrants do not attend school, as school systems generally do not allow children to be absent for prolonged periods. At the origin, there is no any discrimination between children of migrant and non-migrant family. But implementation of these schemes is not well and suffers from a lot of bottlenecks.

2.4 Economic Status of Migrant and Non-migrant Household

Migration has improved the economic condition of migrant households and those households are in relatively better position than non-migrant households at origin. During the field survey, it was observed that poor and most of low caste migrant households do not show the any significant improvement at the origin. The economic condition of households compared in terms of their housing structure, land holding pattern, distribution of assets (other than land), distribution of per capita income (excluding remittance) and distribution of debt.
2.4.1 Employment Structure

Employment structure at first gives the figure of the total number of employed male, female and child labour in respective of migrant and non-migrant households. After the survey of the workforce, this study examines the occupation of the workforce. Male labour worked in diversified fields such as agriculture, construction, manufacture and self employed in the unorganized sector. Female labour worked in mainly marginal or secondary activity. Maximum of female labour engaged in unpaid service and agriculture sector. Continuous demand for cheap and flexible child labour for a large variety of enterprises, informal sector and domestic work still exists.

Table No. 2.11: Total Number of employees within Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employed Male</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-migrant Household</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of employed women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of child labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2013

3 In the above table 0 shows that unemployed member of labour-force who desire to work.
2.4.1.1 Male Labour

Out of 64 households in which single male labour employed, distributed 27 and 37 percent in migrant and non-migrant households respectively. Out of 28 households in which 2 male labours employed, distributed 38 and 8 percent in migrant and non-migrant households respectively. In the migrant household no male labour was found unemployed, whereas 4 percent of non-migrant household have unemployed labour. It means job opportunity at migrant place is greater than origin. On this contrary, the non-migrant household no anyone, male labour found as unemployed, whereas 8 percent of migrant households have three employed male labour.

2.4.1.2 Women Labor

Table 2.11 shows that female of migrant household have fewer shares in workforce than non-migrant female. Out of 28 households in which female have not participated in the workforce distributed 38 and 18 percent in migrant and non-migrant households respectively. The demonstration effect in females of some migrant household is increasing so willingness to work decreased in recent years. Low age male migrants prohibit their wives to work in agriculture work due to show fake social status and some security reason. Among the 80 percent non-migrant household has a single female labour which is relatively greater than migrant household which compromises only 58 percent. The share of two employed females in both households has significantly very low, which is a 4 percent fall under migrant household and only 2 percent related to non-migrant household.

2.4.1.3 Child Labor

The study finds that due to extreme poverty, child labour phenomenon is still operating in this district despite of strict labour and trafficking laws. Out of 100 households 10 household face the
child labour. The share of child labour of migrant household (12 percent) is higher than non-migrant households (8 percent). Child labour of non-migrant is voluntary in nature, whereas in the migrant household, it is both voluntary and non voluntary. Most of the child labour of migrant households migrated with their older male member. Reason behind child migration is that early marriage, advances paid for their parents by agents, debt burden, domestic violence and deprivation of family.

2.4.2 Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-Migrant Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Labour</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Labour</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried Labour</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others(^4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

It can see from Table 2.12 that both migrant and non-migrant worker engaged in a large proportion of casual work. However, casualisation of migrant labour is higher than non-migrant labour that is 52 and 40 percent respectively. Construction sector of the rural economy of origin is less developed than urban migrant place so job opportunity is less for non-migrant labour. Agriculture work is the

\(^4\) Others occupation implies that fishing, beggar and uneven secondary activity such as religious work.
second largest occupation of labour. Migration from rural area of this region to rural Punjab and Haryana is a consequence of the high wage rate in agriculture sector. Migrant agriculture labour (24 percent) is less than non-migrant agricultural labour (36 percent) despite the low wage in agriculture sector. Massive seasonal migration disturbed the equilibrium of agriculture labour market. At the peak agriculture season shortage of agriculture labour is common. Sowing and cultivation period of paddy and wheat is one month earlier in Punjab, therefore, demand-supply gap fill by different phase of group migration. Permanent job of migrant labour is higher than non-migrant labour, 16 percent of migrant labour got salaried work whereas only 8 percent of non-migrant labour got salaried work in manufacturing industry, security guard, unorganised retail store brick industry, house servant/made, animal husbandry and poultry farm. There is only 4 percent of cultivator found in both migrant and non-migrant household due to loss of agricultural land holding. One of the important facts noticed that not a single worker fall under ‘others occupation category’ whereas 6 percent of non-migrant worker belongs to this undefined category.

2.4.3 Structure of Housing at Origin

Housing is one of the basic requirements of life for survival. The house provides safe, secure and healthy place to live, work, and dignity of life. High incidence of poverty and regular intervention of flood in this area reflects the unavailability and low quality of the house. A house provides not only physical protection against the vagaries of nature, but also space and privacy to an individual and his family for physical, emotional and intellectual growth. More importantly, ownership of a house brings about a profound change in his social existence, endowing him with an identity, dignity and a sense of belongingness, thus, integrating him with his immediate
social milieu and enhancing his opportunity for participation in social, economic and cultural life of the society. Considering its importance for the overall wellbeing of individuals and families, right to housing has been enshrined as a basic human right in international human rights instruments and treaties, as well as in the Constitution of India as interpreted by the Supreme Court in many of its judgments.

Table No. 2.13: Type of House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of house</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-migrant Household</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaccha</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pucca</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi Pucca</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2013

Kaccha house is made with mud, bamboo, grass and wood material by rural poor households. Kaccha house has a weak structure which is not protected in the case of natural calamities like flood and thunder. This house is highly sensitive to catch fire in the season of summer. Hygienic condition is also bad. The cost of making a kaccha house is lower than pucca and semipucca house. Despite of these limitations and high incidence of poverty, 23 percent of total households live in kacha house. There is no any significant difference between migrant (24 percent) and non-migrant households (22 percent) on the possession of kaccha house. Pucca house made with sand, concrete, brick, cement and steel rod and its structure is very strong. The very low proportion of households has pucca house that is 15 percent due to higher cost. The study explores that 22 percent migrant households live in pucca house whereas only 8 per cent non-
migrant households have pucca house. This difference is rising due to increased of the income level of migrants than non-migrants labour. Semi pucca house is composite of kacha and pucca structure. It is made with mud or sand, brick, cement, tin shade or khapral or asbestos shade. Moderate cost of semi pucca house is major factor for its popularity. Out of 100, 62 households have semi pucca house and which is distributed between migrant and non-migrant households 54 and 70 percent respectively of total sample. However, even pucca house is not suitable in the flood affected area. In this respect, modern floating model house is more appropriate in this region. Floating house is made with dry bamboo, which is sunk in chemical nearly 30 days, cement, sand, woods and teen shade. Though, floating house presents in negligible in this region due to unawareness of its building technique and unavailability of bridged chemical in the local market.

2.4.4 Land Holding Pattern
2.4.4.1 Distribution of Homestead Land between Migrant and Non-migrant Households

Bihar was one of the first states in India to enact a law, the Bihar Privileged Persons Homestead Tenancy Act, 1947, to grant permanent homestead rights to the rural landless and marginalized communities to settle on raiyati land. Since then various other policies and provisions have also been made by the government of Bihar for granting homestead rights over gairmazarua khas/malik and gairmazarua aam land as well as for allotting house sites to those without access to land. Though these laws, policies and provisions are very clear and simple, it is unfortunate that Bihar today ranks first among the states in terms of rural housing shortage. The report suggests that the government urgently needs to adopt a multi-pronged approach to deal with these numerous obstacles and to streamline the administrative processes and procedures. There is a need to identify
all the landless households that do not have access to and ownership rights over homestead land, to adopt a proactive approach and act in a mission mode to reach out to all those who need to be granted right to housing and homestead land. (Saxena, et. al. 2010).

Table No. 2.14: Distribution of homestead Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of homestead land</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-migrant Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1 Katha</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 Katha</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 Katha</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 3 Katha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2013

Distribution of homestead land in migrant household is better than non-migrant household. The above table shows that 20 percent of non-migrant households have not homestead land, whereas 10 percent of migrant households. Migrant households have less proportion in the relative low area of homestead land than non-migrant households.

2.4.4.2 Distribution of Agriculture Land between Migrant and Non-migrant Households

Access to agriculture land is crucial for sustainable livelihoods and food security for the rural population. To comprising landless labours and marginal farmers who cannot access non-farm employment opportunities for lack of education and skills and are forced to depend seasonally rain fed farming and part time wage employment for sustenance. Leasing in and leasing out of agricultural land should be legalized and permitted within ceiling limits of various states. This would ‘improve the rural poor access to land through leasing and discourage landowners to keep their land fallow, aside
from motivating them to take up non-farm employment without any fear of losing their land right.

**Table No. 2.15: Distribution of Agriculture Land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of agriculture land</th>
<th>Own account agriculture land</th>
<th>Lease in Agriculture land</th>
<th>Total Agriculture land (Lease In + Own account)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant Household</td>
<td>Non-migrant Household</td>
<td>Migrant Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1 Bigha</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- 2 Bigha</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 Bigha</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 Bigha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5 Bigha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

**2.4.4.3 Area of Own Account Agriculture Land**

It is clear from Table No. 2.15 that the non-migrant households have less proportion of agricultural land than migrant households. The data show that 64 and 76 percent of migrant and non-migrant households respectively are landless in terms of own account agriculture land. Distribution of own account agriculture land is biased against non-migrant households as 18, 14, and 4 percent of migrant households have below 1 Bigha, 1-2 Bigha, and 2-3 Bigha own account agriculture land respectively. Whereas in the case 22 and 2
percent of non-migrant households have below 1 Bigha and 1-2 Bigha own account agriculture land respectively.

2.4.4.4 Area of Lease in Agricultural Land

Lease in agriculture land refers to the area under share cropping in which total cost of input bearded by bataidar and total output or agriculture produce distributed between landlord and them at a certain fixed rate. During the field survey, it is observed that willingness to lease in agriculture land of migrant households is lesser than non-migrant households. The above table presents that migrant households have less proportion of agricultural land than migrant households. The data show that 92 and 70 percent of migrant and non-migrant households respectively are landless in terms of lease in agriculture land. Distribution of lease in agriculture land is biased against migrant households. Regarding 6 and 2 percent of migrant households have 1-2 Bigha and 2-3 Bigha lease in agriculture land respectively. Whereas non-migrant households have provide lease in agriculture land as 14, 8, 4, 2 and 2 percent of non-migrant households have below 1 Bigha and 1-2 Bigha, 2-3 Bigha, 3-4 Bigha and 4-5 Bigha lease in agriculture land respectively.

2.4.4.5 Area of Total (own account + lease in) Agricultural Land

The total agriculture land consists of own account agriculture land and total lease in agriculture land. Since both migrant and non-migrant households not provide lease out agriculture land so it excluded from area of total agriculture land. The data shows that 58 and 56 percent of migrant and non-migrant households respectively are landless in terms of total agricultural land. Non-migrant household cast at the comparatively larger size of agricultural land than migrant households. Distribution of total agriculture land for migrant households as 18, 12, and 12 percent have below 1 Bigha, 1-2 Bigha, and 2-3 Bigha whereas in the case of non-migrant households 10, 16, 14, 2 and 2 percent for below 1 Bigha, 1-2 Bigha, 2-3 Bigha, 3-4 Bigha and 4-5 Bigha respectively.
2.4.5 Distribution of Assets (other than Land) between Migrant and Non-migrant Households

This study examined the seven assets other than land, as television, mobile, radio, gas stove, motorcycle, cattle and bicycle. Except bicycle in each of assets migrant households have greater proportion. In this way this study finds that migrant household is relatively wealthier than non-migrant households.

Figure No. 2.1 Distribution of Assets (other than land) between Migrant and Non-migrant Households

Source: Field Survey, 2013

2.4.5.1 Television

Television is luxury goods and one of the important sources for entertainment. Lack of purchasing capacity, less connection and regular supply of electricity in the rural area, it leads to less of households have television. However, 12 percent of migrant households have television whereas only 4 percent in the case of non-migrant households.

2.4.5.2 Mobile

Mobile provides greater connectivity people. With greater connectivity, migrant links to family member and at the origin both
households have greater security on against of social evils. The expansion of communication sector leads to better facility as high signal and coverage area. Therefore, demand for mobile is increasing. The data reveal that higher proportion (96 percent) of migrant households have mobile relative to non-migrant households (72 percent). During the field survey, it is observed that market of mobile and related accessories is growing in the rural economy. Often migrant labours sell at a cheaper rate (`2500 to 5000 of China set sells at about `500 to 1000) when leaving the origin for migration purpose.

2.4.5.3 Radio

Radio is still the main source of information and news in the rural India. In the most of mobile, radio facility is inbuilt; therefore, demand for radio is decreasing. However, migrant household has higher than non-migrant households which is 54 and 30 percent respectively.

2.4.5.4 Gas Stove

The gas stove is a modern furnace, which emits less pollution than traditional furnace. Despite the less of gas distributor and irregularity in supplying gas cylinder, 22 percent of migrant households have gas stove whereas only 6 percent in the case of non-migrant households. During the field survey observed that not a single households using the gas stove regularly but at rare conditions.

2.4.5.5 Bicycle and Motorcycle

The bicycle is main transportation convenience in the rural area for casual labours who work outside. The figure points out that 72 percent of migrant households have bicycle whereas 80 percent in the case of non-migrant households. The motorcycle is totally irrelevant for both households. Only 2 percent of migrant households have a motorcycle. It is purchased by individual interest and less
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economically utilised. However, it may be potential to economically utilisation.

2.4.5.6 Cattle

Regarding livelihood opportunity, cattle played big role in the maintaining nutrition level for poor households. The cattle also provide additional income. During the field survey, it is observed that about 1 to 2 breeding cattle like a cow or buffalo and goats in the most of households who have cattle. From the above figure it clear that 52 percent of migrant households have cattle, whereas 42 percent in the case of non-migrant households.

2.4.6 Distribution of Income (Excluding Remittance)

Distribution of per capita monthly income between migrant and non-migrant households shows the comparative economic status at origin and how they differ without remittance.

Table No. 2.16: Per Capita Monthly Income (Excluding Remittance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (Excluding Remittance)</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-migrant Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No any Source of income</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 200</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 to 500</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 to 800</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 to 1100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 to 1300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

Table No. 2.16 shows that per capita monthly income of non-migrant households is greater than migrant households respectively to higher
income brackets. About 12 percent of extremely poor prone migrant households have no any source of income. Per capita income of non-migrant households is not below than ₹ 200 while 36 percent of migrant households related to this lower level of income. Major proportions of non-migrant households have per capita income in the range from ₹ 500 to 1100 that is 68 percent and 14 percent of non-migrant households securing from ₹ 1101 to 1300. The less proportion of migrant households has per capita income above ₹500. At the origin migrant households have less source of income. Economic opportunity for labour of non-migrant households are more than migrant households, but migrant labour not desired to work for less paid job. Even seasonal migrant labours face identity problem in the construction sector of the local economy. Therefore job opportunity in the construction sector is less for migrant labour due to their uneven presence.

2.4.7 Distribution of Debt between Migrant and Non Migrant Households

Debt is one of the important sources of economic development for rural economy. However, it is believed that debt as a bad, evil and once a poor sunk in debt cycle there is little probability for comes out. This is true in only those cases, in which debt is utilized to reimburse the old debt and interest payment, unproductive consumption to drink or conspicuous expenditure like marriage ceremony, religious worship and festivals. Though, there is less productive utilization by very few households for agriculture or others genuine purpose. According to direct and indirect observation during the field survey, it has been found in this study that in the research area, both households consults for credit to meet its basic requirement like food and filling the gap of the liquidity crisis in lean agriculture season. Therefore, the poor have only option for meeting their own
requirement through debt. Without the facility of credit, at initially poor labours can’t be migrated for longer destination.

**Table No. 2.17: Distribution of Debt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt level</th>
<th>Total non institutional debt</th>
<th>Total institutional debt</th>
<th>Total debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant Household</td>
<td>Non-migrant Household</td>
<td>Migrant Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without debt</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 10000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001 to 20000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001 to 30000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30001 to 40000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

Debt is composed of institutions and non-institutional credit. Non-institutional credit is given by big landlords, Sahukar or relatively rich individuals to needy households. In the agrarian economy, the landlord is the main source for credit and it causes
remain of semi-feudal structure of rural society. Institutional credit provided by bank and financial intermediaries at lower interest rate. This study focused on debt level of migrant and non-migrant households, regarding their composition of non-institution and institution credit.

Table No. 2.17 presents the comparative statistic of debt level of migrant and non-migrant households. This study found that about 52 percent of the migrant households have taken no any type of debt or loan or other credit, whereas only 40 percent non-migrant households without any type of credit. It means that share of debtor non-migrant households have greater than the debtor's migrant household. Lack of bank and financial intermediaries in the rural region, Institutional credit is up to 4 percent of in case of migrant household and 10 percent in the case of non-migrant households have taken credit less than ₹ 10000. There is little difference between migrant and non-migrant households in terms of their share of total debt, which is 18 and 20 per cent respectively.

There is no any difference found between the share of non institutional credit for migrant and non migrant households 18 percent who assign less than ₹ 10000. Only 2 percent of non-migrant household got debts below ₹ 10000 from institutional credit like Self Help Group\(^5\). While no any migrant households found who got credit. The range from ₹ 10001 to 20000 the share of total debt for non-migrant households have relatively higher than migrant households 20 and 8 percent respectively. In which only 2 percent of non-migrant household got institutional credit and rest of households related to non institutional credit. The range between, ₹ 20001 to 30000 the share of total debt for non-migrant households have 12 and 10 percent

---

\(^5\) Those Self Help Group regulated under NABARD, referred as source of institutional credit.
respectively. In which only 2 percent of non-migrant household got institutional credit and rest of households related to non institutional credit. The range from ₹ 30001 to 40000 and above ₹ 40000, both migrant and non-migrant households have only 4 and 6 percent respectively. In the higher range of debt level proportion of both migrant household is equal but less share.

In this study, it was found that non-migrant households had advanced position to fulfill his requirement through debt than migrant households. Also migrant households have a lesser debt requirement than non-migrant households. Non institutional debt is at most equally distributed between migrant and non migrant households. However, distribution of institutional credit biased against migrant household. Though the availability of institutional credit is limited up to some extent, the percentage of households in lower level debt is higher than that of higher income level.

2.5 Conclusion

To sum up, despite immense potential of the agrarian economy of Saharsa district, it's not covering (utilizing) the major workforce. Socio-economic conditions of migrant as well as non-migrant labour households are very miserable in the study area. As far as the comparison in the social status is concerned, the social status of non-migrant household is higher than that of migrant households. While economic status of migrant labour households seems to relatively better than non-migrant labour. To conclude the systematic study on socio-economic condition of migrant and non-migrant households, there is a need to redefine the landlord-labour relationship. The effect of migration on migrant households and economic development of origin are discussed in the next chapter in detail.

*****
3.1 Introduction

Migration is considered as to accelerate the economic activity at origin. The rural out migration effects on economic development in terms of the remittance received, which affects the income distribution pattern among migrant and non-migrant rural labour. Migration has increased the wage level in the local market. It has also enhanced the capital accumulation via different investment strategies adopted by migrants at origin. But the poor migrant households are rarely found the benefits of remittance due to inflation, increasing rate of rent and transportation etc. In the case of internal migration, Deshingkar and Akter (2009) calculated that there are about 100 million circular migrants in India who contribute 10 per cent to the national GDP. In addition to migration also plays a vital role in poverty alleviation through better earning and gained employment opportunities. Whilst, it also increases the risk of illness, health hazards associated with their working conditions (Siddiqui, 2012).

The foremost view of migration and remittances as economic processes with primarily economic outcomes, fails to take into account the cultural meanings, political motivations, or social implications of resource transfers. Investigations into the existence of a correlation between well-being (i.e. Asset ownership in rural areas) and migration arrive at apparently conflicting conclusions about causality. On the one hand, people are in a position to and aspire to
migrate because they are better off; on the other hand, migration improves the economic position of those who migrate and as a consequence increases inequality (Haan, 2000).

This chapter is focused the interaction between the optimistic and pessimistic approach of migration and development. The optimistic view of migration from this region is that emerging composite pattern of rural to rural and rural to urban migration trend. This is more popular and provides relatively higher remittance rather than any other pattern of migration. This chapter also highlights the individual based health problem at different patterns of migration. As far as working conditions are concerned, rural to rural migration is less risky as compared to rural to urban migration.

3.2 Cause of Migration from District Saharsa

Migration may cause of social, political setup, economic and worse environment conditions. A number of push and pull factors drive migration. Among them income is one of the driver, as people migrate in search of paid employment. Migration may be based on push factors, which force the individual to migrate in search of work. These factors include debt, poor access to credit, declining access to common property resources or commodity price crashes and discrimination against migrants in public welfare scheme. The higher wage differential between destination and origin is a main pull factor for migration. Though push and pull factors are going hand in hand with each others. For example, higher wage at destination, consider as a pull factor while lower wage at origin implicitly or explicitly treated as push factors. Besides the wage differentials, factors such as population pressure, demographic pressure, or environmental degradation has commonly postulated as “root cause” of migration (King and Schneider 1991, Schwartz, et. al., 1994, Zachariah, et. al.,
2001). Therefore the cause of migration is far behind from traditional push-pull framework.

There are the following reasons of migration from Saharsa district of Bihar:
(i) Social Factors
(ii) Economic Factors
(iii) Environmental Factors

3.2.1 Social Factors of Migration

Caste is a key factor, which plays crucial role in the rural society. Discrimination against the backward caste may be the main cause of migration. Political upliftment of backward caste breaks the caste based Client-Parton relationship as a result of they got motivated for migration. The labour belongs to forward caste, not to do lower or dirty work at origin due to their social prestige. However, at the lower end of migrant place no anyone interested to caste but their work potential. Therefore, migration occurs not only in backward caste, but also in forward caste. They migrate substantially for sustaining their livelihood. On other hand, the demographic factors like higher birth rate lower life expectancy and huge youth population initiates the migration. The population growth rate of this region is higher as compared to other regions. Therefore big family size is common which leads to shortages of food, nutrition level and less take care for each of their family members (Rural population growth causing a Malthusian pressure on natural and agricultural resources). Big family size followed very restrictive and conservative approach so younger members often migrant with their own. Furthermore, the most important cause of migration is social network as the information passes through one migrant to another from different destinations. To communicate the information, the family members, relatives, friends and middlemen play as intermediary role in the migration decision.
Finally, a higher aspiration of modern living standard among youth labour leads to migration despite of survival matters.

3.2.2 Economic Factors of Migration

Economic backwardness, poverty, poor infrastructure, lack of employment opportunity and higher wage differential between origin and destination are the chronic causes of migration. The poor migrant labour got motivated to migrate for earning more money, to accumulate the assets and for development of their families. In addition to migration becomes to evitable as stagnant agriculture (associated with huge disguised employment). Rural agrarian economy of Saharsa district suffers from seasonal fluctuation and disequilibrium in the labour market. Because of excess of surplus labour increased in lean agriculture season which have not been supported by lack of non-farm activity. Furthermore, migration is result of skewed distribution of land holding pattern. Migrant labours have inadequate resources to fulfill the basic needs of their livelihood at origin. The major determinants of migration are new pull factors like higher demand of agriculture labour from western green field regions, labour intensive urban construction activities. Manufacturing and growing service industries also attract labour to move different destinations despite of risk of geopolitical agitation. Last but not the least, easy accessibility of transportation facilities such as road, railway and better communication network encourage mobility of labour. For example, after (2005) Saharsa district connected with the meter gauge of the railway network from major metropolitan cities like Delhi, Amritsar and Kolkata which increase the seasonal migration rather than permanent migration.

3.2.3 Environmental Factors of Migration

Environment instability, such as uneven drought, rain and regular intervention of major and minor flood also took part in
migration of the individuals from the Saharsa district. Simultaneously, drought and rain are the main determinants of traditional agriculture production. They directly associated with the monsoon. Due to change in climatic conditions, monsoon pattern has also been changed in this district as a result of uneven rainfall come out from last decade (Directorate of Economics and Statistics Bihar, 2012). Floods are not only responsible for temporary rehabilitation problem for south western part of Saharsa but also it increased the fallow (spread out loamy sand) and water logged land. Consequently, the growth rate of net sown area is declining as a result of agricultural production is being affected severely despite of high potential of agricultural production.

3.3 Process of Circular or Seasonal migration

The rural development of internal migration can be traced back to the mid of 1960-70 which was relevant for developing countries. Basically the concept of circular or seasonal migration has emerged from anthropological and demographic literature of urbanization. Often, it referred to seasonal or periodic migration for work (in agriculture, fishing, hunting, or market commerce), for survival (during droughts, for example), or as a life-cycle process. Circular migration is yet to be properly and comprehensively defined and the term often means differently to different people. Some states question the need for a common, formally agreed definition of what should be a flexible, adaptable policy instrument. For operational purposes, however, states negotiating agreements or implementing policies that incorporated circular migration need a common understanding of what is meant by the term (Newland, 2009). The following four dimensions of contemporary definition of circular or seasonal migration:
The Spatial Dimension (Geography) covers at least two poles: the place of origin and the place of destination. There may be more than two poles of orientation. For example, composite pattern of both rural to rural and rural to urban migration. Migration patterns were further assumed to be influenced by factors such as distance and population densities (Skeldon 1997). In this context, where people are expected to move from low income to high income areas, and from densely to sparsely populated areas, that is, the general notion that migration movements tend towards a certain spatial-economic equilibrium, has remained alive in the work of many demographers, geographers, and economists ever since, and also the underlying assumption of push-pull theories (Casteles & Miller 2003).

The Temporal Dimension (Duration) associated with range from short term movement. For example, short term migration as several months for seasonal agriculture workers and up to several years for skilled temporary workers occurs in India respectively interstate and international migration.

The Iterative Dimension (Repetition) includes more than one cycle. Migrants who make only one round trip between the places of origin and destination are normally described as return migrants. A more fluid pattern of back-and-forth movement, involving repetition of the cycle, is the distinguishing feature of circular migration.

The Development Dimension examined the contribution of the positive benefit of migration at place of origin and destination. Parameter taken into account for the development dimension is disputed and varies from place to place like
individual development vs. family development, economic and social parameter of different communities etc.

3.4 Destination Place of Migration

The alternative choice of destination is strongly determined by social networks, people from a particular caste and village tend to go to the same destination and into similar occupations. Scheduled Caste (SCs) and extremely backward caste are engaged in both short distance and long distance migration, but usually in the lowest paid jobs. Migrants belonging to the broad and diverse category of OBC are graduating from farm work to working in a variety of industries where earnings are higher (Deshingkar, 2006 a). Jobs tend to be in factories, agro-processing plants or working as porters, domestic servants, bus conductors, rickshaw pullers, street hawkers, petty traders, and construction workers. Migrants are often willing to get jobs when others cannot or do not want to do (those that are dirty, degrading and dangerous). The work is commonly poorly paid and insecure but it is very attractive to those from marginalized areas where wages are too low to lead their livelihood (Deshingkar, 2005). It has been clearly noticed that out-migration rates in the study area of Bihar have experienced a second fold since the 1970s. So that migration is now mainly to urban areas as work availability has declined in traditional destinations in irrigated Punjab (Deshingkar, 2003). When migrant networks are established to destination place, the cost of migration reduces which causing those who are less well-off to be able to migrate as well. Saharsa is one of the bulk suppliers of labour in the green revolution fields of Punjab, Haryana and western Uttar Pradesh.
Table No. 3.1 Migration towards destination Place (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

From the Table No. 31, it is clearly reflects that Punjab is popular destination with 44 percent migration followed by Delhi with 32 percent of migration from the study area. Punjab provides lots of opportunities in agriculture sector so it stimulates the rural to rural migration whereas capital of India provide a number of opportunities in development activities such as construction, garments etc. The contribution of migration labour to the destination place such as Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal and other states is 8, 4, 4 and 8 per cent respectively.

**Figure No. 3.1 Willingness of Migration and Migration before Current Year**

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*
The Figure No. 3.1 shows that 40 per cent labour want to migrate in search of livelihood, whereas remaining 60 percent labour does not want to migrate if a job opportunity is available at origin as per their skill, efficiency and ability to work. On the other hand, 92 per cent labour was found to be aware of the migrant places, whereas 8 per cent labour was found during primary survey that they have migrated for the first time.

3.5 Role of Social Net Work for Migration

There is a strong integration between social network and migration. It provides the social framework and institutional mechanism for migration. Sender of information related to job opportunities and nature of job at destination places provide clear picture related to job such as wage rate, monthly expenditure, saving and living standard at destination place. The information from friends and relatives are reliable but not the same from the middle men/agent/contractor. Generally, the middle men/agents/contractor made fraud and cheated them by paying less of remuneration. The victim of migrant labour is very poor and indebted to private creditors. Child trafficking is also increasing in this region due to the presence of traffickers. The traffickers were agents/middlemen belonging to the same area. They were often involved in the type of work of employment that are illegal for children and also void the rules and regulation of human rights. Despite, migrant households often receive various kinds of support, including funds mobilized through family networks (social linkages with social capital). In turn, they are expected to fulfill their duties to their family members (Hoang 2011). There are several mechanisms for migration decision. Opportunities to migrate are biased against those without social contacts and at least the minimum resources (Milanovic, 1987; Breman, 1996).
3.6 Patterns of Migration

Three types of migration occur in this region i.e. rural to rural, rural to urban and both rural to rural and rural to urban destination. Circular migration associated with not only rural to rural, but also rural to urban migration can be seasonal or periodic nature. The third type of semi permanent\(^6\) migration is a combination of rural to rural and rural to urban migration. It was found that only male member of every household has participated in circular migration and they linked up with their family temporarily at native place.

---

6 Semi permanent migration refers to those migrant who stay at migrant place more than eight months in a year and return back to home or origin place.
3.6.1 Rural to Rural Migration

Rural to rural migration occurs to agriculture activities, though few workers also engaged in nonfarm activity. The crops of paddy and wheat one month later at their native place encourage them to rural to rural migration in agriculture season. Once again higher agricultural wage differential at destination forced them to rural to rural migration process relatively. The contribution to the total migration process in the study area is 16 per cent, which is comparatively less than that of other patterns of migration. The most important benefit of rural to rural migration is that the expenditure is less than that of urban migrant place. In the one agriculture season, they save approximately ₹ 20000 to ₹ 22000 by an individual migrant labour. The problem associated with rural to rural migration is that lack of housing and toilet facility.

3.6.2 Rural to Urban Migration

Rural to urban migration is the most popular pattern of migration. Its share is 48 per cent among the migrant workers, which is the highest. Rural to urban migration occurs due to higher job opportunities in the construction sector, manufacturing firms, home based workers, bus conductors, rickshaw pullers, street hawkers, and rag pickers etc. The informal sector is also growing fast in the urban areas which are creating higher demand of migrants. In the urban destination, migrants are often willing to do jobs that others cannot do or do not want to do due to unprofitable work, dirty, humble, degrading, heavy and dangerous nature. Deshingkar (2005) argued that work is commonly poorly paid and insecure but it is very attractive to those from marginal areas where wages are too low to make a living.
3.6.3 Composite Pattern of Rural to Rural & Rural to Urban Migrations

This type of migration pattern, bridges the gap between demand from agriculture sector and construction sector due to shortage of supply of labours. At present, this type of migration has increased from this region due to better communication network regarding the opening for vacancies, higher wage rate and better transportation facility to the metropolitan cities. This type of migration is demanded during sowing season i.e. June July for the agricultural labour from Punjab. After then they move towards urban Punjab or National Capital Region (NCR), in search of a job in nonfarm sector. Further they move back to rural Punjab during harvesting season of paddy. This process is also same in wheat harvesting and lean agriculture season. Deshingkar (2006 a) find that high productivity agricultural area (green revolution areas) continues to be important destinations, but more migrants are opting for non-farm employment in both rural and urban areas because of greater earnings. Therefore, composite pattern of migration increased from this region according to their needs for getting jobs. Under the composite pattern migration, 38 per cent of migrant labours move both at the rural and urban destination. In this migration pattern, there is greater scope for earning and saving than rural to urban migration.

3.7 Migration Period

The present study examines the total months of migration in one phase with the respect of different pattern of migration. As seasonal migration is to be periodic in nature and varies from the pattern of migration to another. The nature of jobs also varies from one pattern of migration to another. It is also analysed in the study that the total months of migration in a year. Total duration and frequency of migration depend on transportation cost, their health status and
intensity of emotional attachment with family and community at origin.

Table No. 3.2 Interlink between Pattern and Phase of Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration period in one phase</th>
<th>Pattern of migration (in Percent)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural to rural migration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ≥ 2 month</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ≥ 4 month</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ≥ 6 month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6 month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                              | Rural to urban migration         |       |
| 1 ≥ 2 month                  | 0                                | 0     |
| 2 ≥ 4 month                  | 12                               | 8     |
| 4 ≥ 6 month                  | 28                               | 30    |
| >6 month                     | 6                                | 0     |
| Total                        | 46                               |       |

|                              | Both rural to rural & urban migration |       |
| 1 ≥ 2 month                  | 0                                | 0     |
| 2 ≥ 4 month                  | 8                                | 26    |
| 4 ≥ 6 month                  | 30                               | 58    |
| >6 month                     | 0                                | 6     |
| Total                        | 38                               |       |

Source: Field survey, 2013

Table No. 3.2 shows that the linkage between migration pattern and period of migration in one phase. Among the various types of patterns of migration, 10 per cent rural to rural migration have been found for very short period of time that is only (1 ≥ 2 month). These are found only in sowing season of paddy for rural migration. Migration phase of 2 ≥ 4 months has 6 per cent of the total migrant labour. Under this phase, these migrants have worked in agriculture activity in peak season and animal husbandry in lean season. The other phase of migration 4 ≥ 6 months is more popular in rural to urban where 28 per cent and third composite pattern of migration by 30 per cent. The longer period of time of migration may cause in increasing the family gap, decreasing of role in community decision and also reduced the social importance to the migrants. Therefore, migration duration above six months (related to only rural to urban migration) that is as low as only six percent of the total migrant labour.
force. The working days related to sowing and harvesting of paddy and wheat about 125 days. Therefore, phase of rural to rural migration occurs to a very shorter period of time.

![Figure No. 3.3 Total Months of Migration in a Year](source: Field Survey, 2013)

From the Figure No. 3.3, this is clearly evident that 62 percent of labour has migrated for 6 to 8 months in a year. The migration period exceeds above 8 month is only 4 per cent. And only 2 per cent of labour has migrated to a very shorter period of time that for only one to two months. This section of migrant labour is not a part of regular migration. For the rural destination, 14 per cent of labour migrated for shorter duration between two to four months. About 18 per cent of total migrant labours stay at the destination place for 4 to 6 months in a year.

### 3.8 Remittances, Pattern of Migration and Total Number of Migrants

There is a strong correlation between remittances and pattern of migration. Remittance sent by migrant labours becomes of

7 Regular migrants referred to those labour who migrate for three or more than three years consequently.
heterogeneous nature. Some of remitters send remittance to their families on the monthly basis. Others send it on different occasion or as per families’ needs or on festival. But the total remittance has been estimated in this study on the yearly basis. Remittance sends through relatives or their own account. But a bulk amount of remittance delivered through the middle men. A number of migrant labours and his family have to suffer high rate of commission, bad delivery, and irregularities in mode of payments and sometimes fraud and cheating by these middle men. In the absence of bank account and undeveloped banking habits are the main reasons for inconvenient for getting remittance.

**Table No. 3.3 Interlink between Remittances, Pattern of Migration and Total Number of Migrants in a Household**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total money sent to family in a year</th>
<th>Pattern of migration</th>
<th>Total number of migrants in a household</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural to rural migration</td>
<td>Rural to urban migration</td>
<td>Both rural to rural &amp; rural to urban migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12001 – 24000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24001 – 36000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36001 – 48000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48001 – 60000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60001 – 72000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 72000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*
It is clearly depicted from the Table No. 3.3 that the remittance is not more than ₹ 48000 in the rural to rural migration. It is comparatively lower than that of other pattern of migration. While rural to urban migrants and migrants belong to composite patterns of migration, both the type of patterns sent remittance varies from ₹ 24001 to above ₹ 72000. It is clearly shown from the table that only 8 percent of migrants sent remittance range from ₹ 12001 to ₹ 24000 who follows rural to rural pattern of migration. The remittance, range from ₹ 24001 to ₹ 36000 and ₹ 36001 to ₹ 48000, sent by the migrants of rural to rural and migrants belong to composite patterns of migration. Both the type of patterns has fewer shares that are 4 and 2 per cent of total migrant labours respectively. In this same remittance range, rural to urban migrants have a little bits different proportion as 6 and 8 per cent respectively. Only 10 per cent of total migrants who belong to composite of both pattern sent remittance range between ₹ 48001 to ₹ 60000. There is also a strong linkage between higher bracket of remittance and the number of migrants in a single household. Generally, in a single household one or two male members migrated for earning purposes. In this regard, this study finds that 56, 40 and 4 per cent of households have a single, double and triple migrant labour. The table also shows that remittance below ₹ 60001 remit by only single migrant. The remittance range from ₹ 60001 to ₹ 72000 remitted by 6 and 16 percent of households which have one and two migrant labours from a particular household respectively. The remittances above ₹ 72000, is remitted by 6, 24 and 4 per cent of households which have one, two and three migrant labours in a particular household respectively. It means higher bracket of remittance is the result of more than one labours. However, only 12 per cent of households, which have single migrant labours, remit more than ₹ 60000 due to their higher skills and wage. Thus, the present
study finds that migrant labours belong to rural to urban and composite pattern of migration remit more remittance than rural to rural migrant labours despite of higher propensity of saving at rural destination.

3.9 The Role of Remittance for Rural Economic Development

Remittance is the main source of income for migrant households who live at origin. This remittance is substituted for home production and also increases household income, reduces depth and severity of poverty. It acts as insurance during uncertainties like floods, drought and other natural calamities. Remittance creates multiplier effects in the local economy. Moreover, other externalities of migration may result in a social gain in terms of income distribution and productive investments, and social cost such as the loss of human and physical capital at origin. However, migrants labour may provide valuable information and assistance, which alter the distribution of returns to migration for other non-migrant labours. Thus, the effect of migration and remittances on inequalities over time depends critically upon social network effects and migration spill over. But the most difficult task is to separate and measure them. The one of the most important roles of remittance is towards assets accumulation. Deshingkar and Grimm (2004), stresses that there is strong evidence that internal migration can lead to positive change in both sending and receiving areas. Deshingkar (2006 b) argued that migration can play an important role in reducing vulnerability, improving food security, stimulating land markets in sending areas. It is also increased local wages and the demand for local goods and services and generally improving the economy. There is some positive impact on the agriculture as remittance initiates the investment in agricultural inputs and insures the regular flows of capital into small farms. The remittance can be transformed into the agrarian structure at origin via
diffusion of modern agricultural technology suitable for the adverse environments through the green field’s migrant labours. During the field survey, it has been seen that traditional agriculture casting process is disappearing and developed a modern, scientific practices which produced high yield in the area. Remittance brings the cultivated land accessible to marginal and landless households. Some of skilled migrants have returned back and establish remunerative businesses but these are limited opportunities. Most of these skills cannot be used locally due to poor infrastructure and marketing links in the study area. In the short seasonal migration accelerates the derived demand due to increase of income and operating of demonstration effect among migrant households. Therefore remittance provides the lot of scope for growth of the consumer goods market in this region. Migration increases their family incomes, and reduces poverty at the family level.

3.9.1 Asset Creation through Remittance

Land is unmovable assets which are precious sources for leading peaceful life with dignity. Most of migrant labours suffer from unavailability of their own house and home stead land. However, those migrant households have home stead land before migration. Generally, this is not sufficient as compared to their family size. Therefore, first priorities of migrant labours become to purchase home stead land with the help of surplus of remittance. Also agriculture land purchased through remittance but in less proportion they give the less preference to agricultural land because of less agriculture labour. In addition to they got lack of cooperation by other farmers or a mentality of feudal agriculture system, agrarian conflict and higher cost incur for cultivation. The study is also examined the relationship between the purchase of home stead land, agriculture land and total number of migrant labours in a family.
Table No 3.4 Investment in land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase of homestead land</th>
<th>Total number of migrants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 Katha</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ≥ 2 Katha</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ≥ 3 Katha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not have</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase of agriculture land</th>
<th>Total number of migrants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0.25 Bigha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25 ≥ 0.50 Bigha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50 ≥ 0.75 Bigha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75 ≥ 1.00 Bigha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not have</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2013

The Table No. 3.4 shows that about 58 per cent of households had purchased homestead land in different area. On the other hand, 22 per cent of households had purchased agriculture land. Cost of homestead land is increasing very fast due to scarcity and fragments of homestead land and growth in the family size. Homestead land purchased in small plots and measured in Katha. Out of total sample migrant households 34 percent purchased below one Katha, 18 percent purchased 1 to 2 Katha and 6 per cent of migrant households purchase 2 to 3 Katha of homestead land respectively. While 42 percent of migrant households found without homestead land in the study area. Homestead land between 2 to 3 Katha have purchased by very low as 2 and 4 per cent of households which have respectively one and two
migrant member. The total area of agriculture land below 0.25 Bigha purchased by 2 per cent of households which have single migrant labour. Then the area of agriculture land between 0.25 to 0.50 Bigha, purchased by 4 per cent of households where 2 – 2 households have one and two migrant labours. Agriculture land between 0.50 to 0.75 Bigha in area is purchased by 6 percent of households who have two migrant labours. Whereas the area of agriculture land between 0.75 to 1.00 Bigha, purchased by 10 per cent of households in which 4 and 6 households have two and three migrant labours respectively. This study found that migrant households purchased homestead land higher than agriculture land. Investment of homestead land is not influenced by number of migrant labour in a single household. However, agriculture land is purchased by households who have generally more than one migrant labour.

**Figure No. 3.4 Investment in other durable assets through remittance**

![Pie chart showing investment distribution](image)

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

The Figure No. 3.4 represents that about one half i.e. 48 per cent of migrant households spend their remittance on the construction or maintenance of the house. While 2 percent of households invest
their remittances in purchasing fixed assets as jewellery and motorcycle whereas 12 percent invest their earning on durable goods such as television. Very Low expenditure i.e. below ₹ 20000 is invested in purchasing agriculture tools like water pump set or pesticides spray machine which are purchased by only 2 per cent of migrant households. It is found during field survey with the help of observation method that very few respondents have the trend for purchasing of luxury goods like jewellery and motorcycle. However, this is not to have interest, but regarding the higher cost of these commodities and beyond his purchasing capacity.

3.10 Effects of Migration on Income Inequality

The effects of migration on income inequality between migrant and non-migrant households is examined with the help of distribution of per capita income excluding and including remittance. Rural labour out-migration and income distribution is mutually interactive and determinative each other. Each plays cause and effect role reciprocally. Out-migrant workers have a direct effect not only on the growth of their household income, but also an indirect effect on labour productivity of members residing at their origin. The impact of rural migration on income inequality in rural areas depends upon whether most of the out migrant workers are from low income or high income families (Li Shi, 1999).

Table No. 3.5 Distribution of per capita monthly income (Including Remittance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per capita monthly income (Including Remittance)</th>
<th>Migrant Households</th>
<th>Non-migrant Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 – 1000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Table No. 3.5 shows that per capita income of migrant households is greater than non-migrant households in the higher income brackets. The higher income bracket indicates that not a single non-migrant household have their income more than ₹ 1501. Among, 20 percent of migrant households have income level between ₹ 1501 to ₹ 2000, and 4 percent each from ₹ 2001 to ₹ 2500 and from ₹ 2001 to ₹ 2500 respectively. Under the lower average income bracket from ₹ 501 to ₹ 1000; the proportion of non-migrant households is higher than that of migrant households at 62 and 28 percent respectively. While under the upper average bracket from ₹ 1001 to ₹ 1500, the proportion of migrant households is higher than non-migrant households with 40 and 20 per cent respectively.

**Table No. 3.6 Income Inequality within rural labour Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Gini Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income inequality within MHs (Excluding Remittance)</td>
<td>0.52787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income inequality within MHs (Including Remittance)</td>
<td>0.19575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income inequality within NMHs</td>
<td>0.19174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income inequality between overall rural labour households</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.23868</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Calculated by author from field survey, 2013*
Per capita income inequality has been measures in terms of Gini Coefficient. The higher value of the Gini Coefficient shows more unequal distribution of income. From the Table No. 3.6 it reveals that migration decreased the income inequality within migrant households as remittance helps to equalize the income inequality. Excluding remittance, income inequality within migrant households is high. This shows that migration happens not only from extremely poor prone labours, but also from the labours that have more income sources at their origin. After including of remittance income inequality decreased 63 per cent from 0.52787 to 0.19575 of Gini coefficient. Within the both migrant as well as non-migrant household income inequality is slightly different with 0.00401 Gini coefficients. However, income inequality between overall rural labour households is comparatively higher than within migrant and non-migrant households by 22 and 24 percent respectively. Including migrant as well as non-migrant households Gini coefficient is 0.23868. This implies that migration increases the overall impact on the income inequality between migrant and non-migrant rural labour households across villages. Hence it proved that migration accelerates the income differential between migrant and non-migrant households and leads to improvement in income distribution within migrant households. In some cases it is found that an adequate remittance flow alone cannot cause significant changes. Smooth functioning at local level, institutions and policy interventions are needed to be undertaken.

3.11 Effect of Migration on Labour Market

“If the Kosi area [and much of North Bihar] provides anything to economic growth in India, it seems increasingly to be labour”. (Rodgers, 1983)

The study area has large number of unskilled and cheap labour force. The phenomenon of seasonal migration is steady and
gradually due to higher wage differential and lack of job opportunities during lean agriculture season. Therefore, rural agrarian labour market equilibrium disturbed by the shortage of labour in peak agriculture season at origin. Though, cultivated land is not affected by a shortage of labour because of migrants gradually migrated in the small groups in the different phase. One of the important benefits of seasonal migration is to reduce disguised unemployment and increasing labour productivity in terms of intensive utilisation of agricultural labour. There is a significant hike in the agriculture wage level as a result of seasonal migration. Migration increases the bargaining power of agriculture labours of migrant as well as non-migrant households. Though, it remains in the form semi feudal structure due to higher debt level of both types of labour households. At the end of 20th century, the rural agrarian economy changed their development strategy from labour intensive to a capital intensive approach. Thus weakening their capacity to absorb surplus labour may be the lacuna. On the other hand, due to population growth and intensification of farming, the absolute size of the rural labour force and amount of rural surplus labour were still on the increase. Therefore out-migration of surplus labour becomes to inevitable (Li Shi, 1999).

From the case study of Kosi region of Bihar, Rodgers (1983) found that the basic problem was not lack of employment (in a normal agricultural year average employment levels were pretty high) but depressed wages. Wage-fixing was mainly controlled by few larger households, acting as wage leaders for the village as a whole, or for particular segments of the village labour market. The interests of these landlords, taken together with efficiency considerations, patronage, and traditional institutions generated powerful forces under-lying wage-fixing. Labour forces which are often underestimated in the design of a government policy.
3.11.1 Working Hour

Migrant labourers face generally harder work, difficult duties and more overtime. Whereas, non-migrant labour do not face over time activity and prefer to more leisure at their origin place.

Table No. 3.7 Total Work hours in a Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total work hour in a day</th>
<th>Migrant labour</th>
<th>Non-migrant labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 8 Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Hours</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hours</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hours</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12 Hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

The Table No. 3.7 represents that the difference between working hour in a day between migrant and non-migrant labours. At the destination place, not a single migrant labour was found working for less than 8 hours, whereas, 6 percent of non-migrant labour worked for less than 8 hours per day in the secondary activity such as animal husbandry, fishing, etc. 54 percent and 60 percent of migrant and non-migrant labours worked for 8 hours in a day respectively. The casual and agriculture workers do not face overloaded work at both migrant and origin’s work site and they engaged to work for 8 hours per day. From the previous decade, contractualisation in the infrastructure sector is growing very fast in India. Therefore, exploitation of contractual labour force is also increasing in terms of working hours. At the migrant place, 14 and 22 percent of migrant
labourers worked for 9 and 10 hours per day respectively. While at the origin, 30 and 4 percent of non-migrant labour worked for 9 and 10 hours per day respectively. At the migrant place 4, 4 and 2 percent of migrant labour worked for 11, 12 and more than 12 hours per day respectively. However, not a single non-migrant labour found as worked more than 10 hours per day.

3.11.2 Job Availability

Job opportunity at migrant place and more working days in a week are greater than that of at origin. It has clearly shows from the Table No. 3.8 at the migrant place, 76 percent of labour got 7 work days in a week it means availability of job opportunities if they desired to work. Remaining 24 per cent migrant labours got 6 work days in a week. There is reason behind this is voluntary weekend or holly day during the week. Whereas, non-migrant labours often face job crisis at their origin. In the agrarian economy of origin, approximately 90 to 120 work days created by cultivation of crops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total working days in a week</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-migrant Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Days</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Days</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2013

This study finds that about 42 per cent of non-migrant worker got an average of 3 working days in the week. Their primary activity
is concern with agriculture laborer. In the non farm sector 24, 16 10 and 8 per cent of non-migrants labour got 4, 5, 6 and 7 work days per week respectively. In the recent years there is a continuous trend of creation of a lot of working days in the embankment area due to proper maintenance of band. The major and minor bridges have been erected on the river and its branches open for better communication. Despite development in construction sector, job creation capacity of these projects doesn't absorb total labour force.

3.11.3 Mode of Payment

Both the migrant and non migrant labours may get the payment into three modes, i.e. daily, weekly and monthly. Casual labour of the construction sector and some manufacturing unit, earn wages on the daily basis. Similarly, at origin the contractual process is slower than migrant place. Therefore, the proportion of daily wage earner of non-migrant labour is high i.e. 84 percent while 40 per cent migrant labour earn wages on daily mode. Non-migrant labour does not get payment in weekly mode while 34 per cent of migrant labour got the payment in weekly mode. In the rural agrarian economy of Punjab labour have an option to earn wages on the basis of either daily or weekly mode.

Table No. 3.9 Mode of Payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of payment</th>
<th>Migrant labour</th>
<th>Non-migrant labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*
Migrant labour who got payment in monthly mode is 20 percent as compared to 8 percent of non migrant labour. The main reason behind it is the high proportion of salaried labour with respect to non-migrant labour. However, 6 and 8 percent migrant and non-migrant labour respectively, earn money on the different occasion when they need money or employer gives money according to his convenience.

3.11.4 Wage Inequality between migrant and non-migrant labour

Before going to measure wage inequality, the study focuses on the wage distribution between migrant and non-migrant labours. The Table No. 3.10 gives the comparative statistic of average per day wage between migrant and non-migrant labour. In the very low level wage groups like ₹ 51 to ₹ 100 and ₹ 101 to ₹ 150, no any migrant labour is found, whereas non-migrant labours proportion is 24 and 12 percent respectively. This very low wage level reflects the wage of agricultural labour in the agrarian economy of origin. On this contrary, at the migrant place, the agriculture wage rate is high and on an average of ₹ 350 to ₹ 450 per day. Though at the migrant place, wage is paid according to one Killa of sowing or harvesting of crops in the range of ₹ 2000 to ₹ 2200. Generally, one Killa of agriculture land worked out by 4 to 6 labours.

Table No. 3.10 Distribution of Wage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average wage in a day</th>
<th>Migrant Labour</th>
<th>Non-migrant Labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51 – 100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101- 150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 – 200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201- 250</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also the average daily wage rate of casual unskilled & skilled workers in the domestic helper/Construction/Manufacturing sector at the origin is lower than destination place. An unskilled migrant worker got wage in the range of ₹ 200 to ₹ 350 whereas non-migrant unskilled worker got the wage in the range of ₹ 160 to ₹ 250. On the other hand, some skilled migrant worker got wage in the range of ₹ 350 to ₹ 450 whereas non-migrant semi skilled worker got the wage in the range of ₹ 300 to ₹ 400. Therefore, non-migrant casual unskilled labour earn wages in a day is ₹ 151 to ₹ 200 and ₹ 201 to ₹ 250 which of 20 and 36 percent respectively. Whereas only 2 and 16 per cent migrant labour (work in domestic service or monthly earner in the unorganized sector) related wage groups of ₹ 151 to ₹ 200 and ₹ 201 to ₹ 250. In the bracket of higher wage level proportion of non-migrant labour is negligible. Only 6 percent of total non-migrant got wages ranging from ₹ 351 to ₹ 400 and none of them found to earn wage above ₹ 400. On the other side, wage of migrant labour is comparative better than non migrant labour.

### Table No. 3.11: Wage Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Gini Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wage Inequality within Migrant Labour</td>
<td>0.10793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Inequality within Non-migrant Labour</td>
<td>0.22326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Inequality between Overall Rural Labour</td>
<td>0.22866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Calculated by author from field survey, 2013*
Wage Inequality within migrant labour is 0.10793 which reveals that less heterogeneity in wage distribution. The wage inequality within non-migrant labour is 0.22326 which is double of migrant labour in terms of Gini Coefficient. The high wage inequality within non-migrant labour as compare to migrant labour is due to more wage differential between agriculture wage, non skilled and skilled construction’s wage in the origin. Whereas the homogeneous wage rate has been found at destination places, and which provides for the same nature of work. Wage Inequality between Overall Labour i.e. migrant as well as non-migrant labour is 0.22866 in terms of coefficient. Hence this study finds that there is little less impact of migration on the wage inequality. The main reason behind overall wage inequality is a scarcity of employment opportunity, surplus labour and undeveloped rural economy of origin.

3.11.5 Change in the Rural Wage Level after 2005-06 at Origin

The enhancement of rural wage is one of the most important effects of migration at origin due to shortage of labour. At the origin most of labour mainly participates in the agriculture and construction sector. To compare changes in the wage level per day, 2005-06 is taken as base year to the convenience of recall of information from respondents. Since the wage level is not uniform distributed in this district, therefore it highlights the change in the wage level accordance with five different sample villages. Agriculture wage paid in the both ways i.e. directly cash forms or well defined forms of share on crops. But to comparative analysis of wage level, it converts into money forms represented by the Table No. 3.12.
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Table No. 3.12: Change in Wage Level after 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>2005-06 Agriculture Wage</th>
<th>Unskilled wage in Construction</th>
<th>2005-06 Skilled wage in Construction</th>
<th>2013 Agriculture Wage</th>
<th>Unskilled wage in Construction</th>
<th>2013 Skilled wage in Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mokana</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>100-125</td>
<td>200-250</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>220-250</td>
<td>350-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithari</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>100-125</td>
<td>200-250</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>220-250</td>
<td>350-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargoan</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>130-150</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>160-180</td>
<td>300-350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakhani</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>130-150</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>160-180</td>
<td>300-350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhagdeva</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>130-150</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>160-180</td>
<td>300-350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2013

From the Table No. 3.12 it is clearly evident that the wage level increased two fold in after 2005-06 in the sampled areas. Though, the increase in the agricultural wage level remains below to the subsistence level. Agriculture wage in the flood affected village (Lakhani and Bhagdeva) is lower than that of other normal villages where agriculture labour provides only ₹ 50 to ₹ 60 whereas before 2005-06 it was only ₹ 20 to ₹ 30 per day. But in the villages of Mokana, Ithari and Bargoan, an increase has been seen in agriculture wage from ₹ 40-60 to ₹ 80-100 per day. In the construction sector wage level of unskilled labour in the Bargoan, Lakhani and Bhagdeva, has changed from ₹ 65-75 to ₹ 160-180. Simultaneously, the wage of skilled labour (i.e. Mason) also changed from ₹ 130-150 to ₹ 300-350. Whilst, the change in wage rate of unskilled and skilled construction labours in Mokana, Ithari has been analysed from ₹ 100-125 to ₹ 220-250 and ₹ 200-250 to ₹ 350 to 400 respectively.

3.12 Effect of Working Condition on Health at Migrant Place

The good working Conditions at migrant place express in terms of availability of the basic facilities i.e. safety measure, first-aid, drinking water, toilet, etc. and their absence increase the risk which effect on health adversely. On the other hand, migrants have to do the work which is often highly sensitive of dangerous for health, such as
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dust, smoke, and muddy tasks. Srivastava (2005) discussed that in India most of the poor internal migrants live in urban slums under unhygienic conditions. Their living conditions lead to health problems and various diseases. Those migrant workers work in tile, chemical factories, brick kilns, quarries, construction sites and mines suffer from occupational health hazards such as lung disease, body ache, sun stroke and skin irritation.

Table No. 3.13 Condition of Work at Migrant Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of work at migrant place</th>
<th>Pattern of migration (in Percent)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural to rural migration</td>
<td>Rural to urban migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got better</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got worse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not Change</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2013

The working condition of migrant labour varied from different patterns of migration at their working site. Out of the 100 migrant labours, 18 per cent was found for whom the working conditions do not changed. Among them 16 percent belong to rural to rural and remaining 2 percent from rural to urban migration. Working condition at rural destination is as same as at origin place. However, unskilled agriculture labour often injured in the operation of modern green technology due to improper training. Only 14 per cent of migrant labour told that they got better opportunities where working conditions are conducive for health. The majority of migrant labours
i.e. 68 percent claimed that the working conditions at destination are worse as they effect on the health. Among them, 38 percent of migrants from both rural to rural and rural to urban pattern of migration got job opportunities in a worse working conditions. Whereas 30 percent of migrant labours from rural to urban migration pattern face more unsecured, low quality work and high risk jobs to affect the health.

**Figure No. 3.5: Intensity of Health Problem of Migrant Labour**

![Intensity of Health Problem of Migrant Labour](image)

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

Intensity of health problem can be measured in three ways as normal, moderate and severe health problem. The normal health problems referred as temporarily weakness, sickness, seasonal viral flu, cold and cough etc. Normal health problems occur due to excess of physical labour or extra working hours, inconvenience in travelling to working place and climatic variation between destination and origin. The moderate health problem referred as short term of injuries; inappropriate functioning of the organ, may cause external physical and unfavorable environmental conditions. Moderate health problems required proper treatment with care. The risk associated with moderate health problems can be reduced by taken extra care. In case of hyper injuries, job provider must have to bear the cost of treatment. But in
actual it does not happened at migrant place. Therefore, compensation and health insurance policy for migrant labours must be redesigned and implemented in an efficient way to ensure them from the uncertainties. The category of sever health problem referred as critically more danger state of prolonged disease. For example several migrants suffer from tuberculosis (TB), hepatitis and unexpected diffusion of swine flu due to toxic and smoking culture at their working site. This study finds that migrant labours that face normal, moderate, and severe health problems at migrant place 64, 22 and 14 per cent respectively.

3.13 Basic Facilities in the Residence of Migrants at Destination

Migrant labours suffer from housing problem. They live in unregistered slums; garage, working site and congested rental room, i.e. share more than two people with limited space and improper ventilation. However, availability of basic facilities, such as electricity, piped water connection and sewage-disposable net work have provided in their residence at limited extent.

Figure No. 3.6 Number of Room Partner at Migrant Place

Source: Field Survey 2013

At the migrant place, 14 percent homeless labours sleep at roadside pedestrian in urban areas or on the field in a rural area. Fewer efforts have been taken by the government on the issue of homeless,
migrant labours due to some political reasons and volatility of seasonal migrants. Only 30 per cent seasonal migrant labours have rental room in which one or two person live together. The 40 per cent of labours who shared a rental room in which 3 to 5 person live. High dense or over populated rental room shared by migrant labour is 12 per cent in the case of 6 to 8 person and 4 per cent fall under above 8 people. The main reason behind the high dense or over populated rental room is a scarcity of houses and high rent in the urban place.

**Figure No. 3.7 Basic Facilities at Destination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Facility</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrified residence at destination</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water attached residence at destination</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence connected with sewage-disposable network</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

At the migrant place, 86 per cent of migrant labours have electrified residence and remaining 14 per cent has residence without electricity. About 56 percent of migrant labours have piped water attached to their residence at destination places. Unavailability and shortage of pure water at an urban destination like national capital region or others is common. As far as sanitation facilities are concerned, 48 percent of migrant labours have residence connected with sewage-disposable network. It creates severe problems for healthy life and retards the working capacity and punctuality to work.
3.14 Conclusion

To conclude, migration from this region is the result of worse economic structure and regular intervention of flood. In the context, the interlink between the pattern of migration and remittance flow, composite pattern of migration get higher share of remittance as compared to other patterns of migration. The propensity to save in rural to rural migration is high, but due to shorter duration of migration they can not be able to earn such an amount of money for their sustenance. Therefore, composite pattern of migration is more popular in this area for sustaining livelihoods. On one hand, migration increases income inequality between migrant and non-migrant household, on the other hand, it reduces the income inequality within migrant households. Remittance received from other destination helps in asset creation. It is found in the study that most of the migrant households have keen interest to purchase homestead land or repaired their residential home. Very few migrant households invested their remittances to purchase agriculture land and durable items. Labour market is also affected by the shortage of supply of labour force during peak agriculture season resulted the wage rate hike. To conclude, despite convergence process of wage equalization, wage inequality between migrant and non-migrant household is not affected. In this study, the pessimistic view of migration shows that working condition at destination is a big issue in front of migrants. They face many problems, such as working with overtime, in dirty climate, and hazardous work which affect their health adversely and ultimately decrease their working capacity.

*****
Chapter - IV

SOCIAL PROTECTION POLICY AND MIGRATION IN SAHARSA DISTRICT

“Migrant workers are the most vulnerable and exploited among the informal sector workers, and have not received any attention in the labour policy. In the States which are sources (origin) of supply of migrant workers ... effective and large-scale effort for vocational training in the labour intensive occupations is required ... amenable to the special needs of the entrants to informal labour markets. In the destination States, the focus of public policy (including Labour Policy) should be to improve the conditions under which the bulk of these in-migrants live and work.”

The 11th Five Year Plan (Vol. 1 para 4.48)

4.1 Introduction

Inter-state circulatory or seasonal migrant labour forces are in low priority for policy framework in India. There is no universal scheme designed for seasonal migrant labours. The existing labour laws are also applicable for migrants. Due to their volatile nature and less awareness of these lows among migrants, they not claim their right against employer or contractor. In this regard, Inter State Workmen (Regulation and Condition of Service) Act 1979 come to solve disputes between migrant labour and contractor across state boundaries. However, this Act is itself questionable due to less migrant labours, industry or contractor enrolled in this Act. Despite of huge supply of labour from Saharsa district, there is not a single migrant support programme like Grameen Vikash Trust (GVT), Aajeevika Bureau etc. However, government of Bihar takes initiative
for migrant labour supportive norms and legislation to provide and protect their needs and right by JEEVIKA scheme under Bihar Rural Livelihoods Programme BRLP.

This study (chapter) examines the distribution of flagship social protection policy between migrant and non-migrant households. It also explores the influences on the migration decision. The role of following major seven welfare policies examined in the rural origin -

1. MGNREGA
2. Public Distribution System
3. Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY)
4. Rastriya Swasthya Bima Yojana
5. Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan
6. National Rural Drinking Water Programme

Social and political status of non-migrant households is better than migrant households due to their present and direct connection with the societal activity while head or other senior male member of migrant households generally absent in the village. Therefore, non-migrant households enjoyed public policy as comparative better than migrant households. This is mainly narrow interest of the local panchayat leader or agent for vote politics. Discrimination against migrant households in the welfare policy accelerates the migration rate. Though, some of flagship welfare schemes directly or indirectly influenced on the economic activity, living condition, health and education of migrant and their family who live at origin. Arjan de Haan and Rogaly Bolw (2002) have stressed that development policies and welfare programmes often aim to reduce labour migration in one way or another. In the present circumstances, government welfare policy should be supportive of livelihood strategies of migrants rather than control for it. Therefore, policies should not design as \textit{laissez-faire approach} on the assumption of migration leads
to the optimal distribution of outcomes. Quite, policies that try to condense exploitation of migrants should be based on an understanding of the complexity of migration pattern, motives and outcomes and take into account migrant’s prospective.

4.2 Challenges of Interstate Seasonal Migrants for Policy Framework

Policy designing for interstate seasonal migrant is very tough task due to lack of concrete definition, floating or volatile nature of migration and their availability of actual data in the particular time and place. The existing designed policy and delivery of services for migrants has not proved to be not successful. Therefore, it must be ensured portability of entitlements for migrants in different social protection schemes.

“Migrants continually face difficulties in becoming a full part of the economic, cultural, social and political lives of society. Regulations and administrative procedures exclude migrants from access to legal rights, public services and social protection programmes accorded to residents, on account of which they are often treated as second-class citizens. Internal migrants face numerous constraints, including: a lack of political representation; inadequate housing and a lack of formal residency rights; low paid, insecure or hazardous work; limited access to state-provided services such as health and education; discrimination based on ethnicity, religion, class or gender; extreme vulnerability of women and child migrants to trafficking and sex exploitation” (UNESCO/UN-HABITAT, 2012).

The cost of production is decreasing due to local labour replaced with cheaper migrant labour. Employees are in a position to exploit them at greater extent by taking hard work. Therefore, without the investment in migrant supporting services development agenda would be not completed. However, not a single governments shown
interest about the problems of migrants due to urban middle class voters are against for low class migrant workers. Even, several regional parties oppose migration on the propaganda of social economic violation. The lack of clarity in official positions on migration – often, if anything, veering towards a denial of the contribution that migration makes to the economy and promoting efforts to ‘relieve distress’ in order to keep migrants in rural areas – all mean that official support for migrants is almost non-existent (Deshingkar, et al, 2008).

4.3 Migrant Support Programme: Strategy and Evidence from Different Destination

Migrant Support Programme in India is still not designed universally for all states due to lack of political interest. Migrant Support Programme run efficiently by different central or states government sponsored agency, Non Government Organisation (NGO) and migrant labour supportive norms and legislation to provide and protect their needs and right. As in governmental policy, migrants have low visibility in the work of political organisations, trade unions and non-governmental/voluntary organisations. Regional political parties and organisations often ascribe economic and social problems to the presence of migrants. Trade unions also sometimes emphasise the negative role of migrant workers (in dampening wages or being instrumental in strike breaking) and are relatively less active in organising these workers to protect their own rights. Nevertheless, some organisations are actively engaged in helping to improve wages and working and living conditions of migrant labourers, and, in the source areas, to improve the flow of information and credit to migrant workers, protect their entitlements, and to develop these areas so as to curb distress migration. A well known example of Migrant Labour Support Programme of the Gramin Vikas Trust (GVT) that is
currently working closely with the DFID funded Madhya Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Project (MPRLP) and another impressive agency is Aajeevika Bureau, which run in southern Rajasthan.

**Figure No. 4.1: Migrant Support Strategy**

![Diagram of Migrant Support Strategy]

*Source: Constructed by author*

**4.3.1 Protection**

Often migrant labours face the identification problem as a result they are excluded from several social welfare schemes at origin as well as destination place. Regarding security concern, migrants also tortured at many occasion due to unavailability of valid identity proof. The Aajeevika Bureau in Rajasthan and GVT in Madhya Pradesh have experimented successfully on the issues of registration and photo IDs which can create a powerful data base of migrant workers across the country and also create a gateway for provision of services to them. The Aajeevika Bureau ID card for migrants has been approved by the Government of Rajasthan and this has created a large demand for it among migrant workers. This card establishes the source address, skill and bona fides of the migrant worker. Therefore after registration and
Photo identity card, migrant’s ability to negotiate in work and wage related power increase, reduction in police harassment in cities and easy to access to basic services at the destination and insurance facilitation against protection of assets and family member at their origin place.

4.3.2 Communication

Communication strategies have been focused on social connection with migrant and their relative and society of origin. In this respect under GVT, distribution of subsidised mobile phones, establishment of telephone booths and messaging service centers. “Aajeevika launched a phone-based help line for workers in Udaipur in August 2011. The helpline involves a dedicated phone line answered by a trained counselor. The Labour Line is supported by the network of walk-in resource centres at the source and destination. Effort is being made to create a wider support network which can respond in case of emergencies. In a period of less than six months, Labour Line has received more than 600 calls, 350 of them being from a small destination city of Udaipur” (Srivastava 2011).

4.3.3 Information

Information strategy at first collects to statistics of demand and supply of migrants and their occupation. After preparation of data set by GVT, it provides relevant information of job opportunity and wage differential between origin and different destination place for migrant labours and contractors. GVT also inform about different government scheme and suitable technology for their occupation. In this way information strategy reduce the costs of migration through interventions both in the source and destination areas. Counseling services is one of the most important parts of information strategy which help migrants in making more informed choices about locations, employers and markets. In this regard, Aajeevika Bureau’s
counseling activities cover prospective migrant workers in the construction, hospitality and retail sectors.

**4.3.4 Migration Resource Centre**

Migration Resource Centre (Shramik Sahayata evam Sandarbha Kendras) established by National Coalition of Organisation for Security of Migrant Workers on the objective to provide information, counseling and respond to public services including health, education other emergencies to migrant workers both at source and at destination. At the origin, the centres are based at the block level, while at the destination they are set up close to either the work sites or residence of the targeted migrant community. These centres are being function in five states including Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, and Gujarat by over 23 organizations. One of the defining features of the centres is its accessibility to the community – efforts are made to keep them within the reach of migrants and also to adapt its functioning to suit the migration and work cycle of migrant workers and provide a safe, enabling environment for them. Similarly, Palayan Seva Kendra (PSK) established under provision of GVT on the behalf of easy access of entitlement of food, shelter and other basic needs and negotiation for one or a group of migrants with contractors and middlemen for obtaining better wages/ deals.

**4.3.5 Settlement of Disputes**

Gramin Vikas Trust has been actively engaged in the settlement of disputes between migrant labours, brokers, contractors and other employers. In West Bengal, the bargaining power of migrant labourers has improved due to the intervention of the Krishak Sabha and panchayats. These organisations have settled local disputes between labourers and employers and worked to close the gaps between immigrant and non-immigrant and male and female wages
Effects of Migration on Rural Labour Households at Origin (A Case Study of District Saharsa of Bihar) (Rogaly et al, 2001, 2002). The Krishak Sabha has negotiated between employers and workers at the district level so that that migrant wages do not undercut local wages and employment, thereby reducing friction with local labourers (srivastava, 2011).

Box No. 4.1: Disputes Resolution in Allahabad

PEPUS or Paryavaran Evam Prodyogiki Utthan Samiti (Society for Environmental and Technical Upliftment), based in Jhusi, Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh, facilitates the process of dispute resolution for migrant labourers, and aims to reach a settlement through mutual dialogue. PEPUS has promoted the formation of a collective of migrant labourers working in brick kilns, known as Bhatta Parivar Vikas Sewa Samiti (Association for Development of Families of Brick Kiln Workers), which is registered under the Indian Societies Registration Act 1860. To resolve disputes, migrant labourers first submit a written complaint at the Migrant Resource Centre (Shramik Sahayata Kendra). After discussion, an information letter is issued by the collective to the opponent party (usually the labour contractor or brick kiln owner), comprising details of the dispute and date of hearing. On the day of the dispute hearing, both parties assemble at the centre, after which the migrant labourer first presents details regarding the dispute, following which the opponent party puts forth their case regarding the complaint. On most occasions, disputes are settled by the proactive mediation and arbitration of the collective. Disputes that cannot be settled through mutual dialogue are forwarded to an advocate of the High Court, who attends the centre on a regular basis and takes necessary action for dispute resolution. Most of the disputes registered between labourers and employers relate to payment, and the centre assists labourers in getting due wages from their contractor or employer.

Source: PEPUS, www.pepus.org

4.3.6 Skill Development

Despite of rising growth of Indian economy there is still demand for skilled as well as unskilled labour. For the long term employment policy prospective it should be alter the short term strategy of unskilled employment and established more skill
development institutes. Regarding the objective of skill enhancement, both Aajeevika Bureau and GVT runs regular skill training and placement programmes for migrant youth in order to help them move up the value chain in labour markets. Therefore training and placement leads to better integration in urban labour markets, increased stability in income and employment cycles, improved confidence levels and bargaining power of skilled migrants’ labourers.

4.3.7 Financial Services

The poor banking and postal infrastructure are very weak and less effective at the origin of migrant labours. For this reason most of poor migrant labours are not familiar with banking habit and face lot of difficulties for sending money home safely and efficiently. The Aajeevika Bureau has promoted a specialized agency name as Rajasthan Shram Sarathi Association (RSSA), a Section 25 Company that offers targeted financial services to migrant workers moving from southern Rajasthan. The initiative has been quite successful in linking the migrant workers to a diverse range of financial products such as micro-credit, insurance and pension. Micro-loans offered by RSSA help migrants to prevent abrupt breaks in the migration cycle and help women to manage volatility in cash flows through informal savings instruments at the source areas. It is a decentralized model that has the ability to cater to the various life-cycle needs of the clients. “Under its financial inclusion programme, migrant workers are linked to bank accounts at both source and destination – the major objectives being promotion of savings and facilitating remittances. This service is much in demand, especially at the destination, where the banks have started accepting the ID cards issued by the Bureau as a valid document to satisfy their Know Your Customer (KYC) requirements. It deserves mention, however, that this acceptance is limited to some banks and often depends on the sensitivity levels of branch managers.
Migrant workers are also linked to different social security provisions of the state and insurance products available in the market. Lately, workers are being linked to the Construction Welfare Board in both Rajasthan and Gujarat” (Srivastava, 2011).

Desingker, et al 2008 find that despite the growth of microfinance few migrants are covered because of their high mobility and inability to form stable groups. Support to savings and remittances are an obvious starting point, but new lending solutions also have to be found. BASIX and Aajeevika Bureau are presently experimenting with the creation of a financial inclusion model for inter-state migrant workers in partnership with banks such as AXIS and SBI. Given the advancement in mobile banking technology, safe remittance solutions have become possible but these are still in the early stages of development and need careful monitoring. Now some private banks have started to recognise the need for financial services for migrants. For example ICICI Bank has recently launched an initiative for Tamil migrants from Thirunelveli who stay in the slums of Dharavi in Mumbai. Some NGOs have also entered this area. Adhikar, an NGO in Orissa has been helping migrants in Gandhidham in Gujarat in remitting money to Orissa. They started this service after the 2001 earthquake when they found more than 10,000 migrants from Khurda district working in and around Gandhidham - at the Kandla port, free-trade zone, IFFCO and for the Railways. Adhikar was supported by the research and innovation fund of CARE India’s CASHE (Credit & Savings for Household Enterprises) project (Deshingkar 2006).

4.3.8 Awareness Generation

Finally, awareness generation strategy focused on the migrant labours about labour right (provision of cheap legal aid) and entitlements. The Aajeevika Bureau runs dedicated financial literacy programmes to educate workers on social security schemes and their
documentary requirements. For example, in formal insurance claim settlement mechanisms, documentation presentation is difficult to fulfil by migrant workers. To getting a copy of an FIR and medical reports in the event of an unnatural death is often too difficult task, especially in long distance inter-state movement. Most of workers also fail to benefits on account of poor awareness levels.

A few organisations like the Nirman Mazdoor Panchayat, the National Campaign Committee for Construction Labourers, and the National Federation of Construction labourers, are working to improve the wages and working conditions of construction labourers, many of whom are migrants. The Mobile Crèches organisation was created in 1986 in Mumbai to meet the needs of children of migrant construction workers, giving children basic literacy and numeracy skills, together with health education. The Child-to-Child programme within Bombay Mobile Crèches introduced specific health messages covering personal hygiene, environmental cleanliness, safe water, prevention of accidents, nutrition, polio, measles, diarrhoea, scabies, leprosy, tuberculosis and bad habits (Srivastava, 2011).

In addition GVT has conducted four orientation programmes for MPRLP staff at Jhabua on migrant support during May 2006. It is also continuously improving its understanding of migrants needs through systematic needs assessments. Institutional initiatives include the strengthening of self-help groups to address the concerns of migrants, recruitment of jankars, for awareness building with panchayats and other agencies and organisations. In order to carry the migrant support activities forward, partnerships are being developed with organisations supporting migrants in urban areas.

**4.4 Migrant Support Model**

Apart from Migrant Support Strategy this study also highlight the all four models laid down by Deshingkar et al (2006) which have
evolved in response to the needs of circular migrants like information about employment opportunity, financial assistance and skill development training.

4.4.1 The Social Protection Model

The Social Protection Model provides subsidised services related to job information, rights awareness creation and other support. Social protection aims to reduce poverty and vulnerability by promoting efficient labour markets, diminishing exposure to risks, enhancing their capacity to protect themselves against hazards and interruption/loss of income. The social protection model is suitable for poor migrants who cannot find for themselves in a job market that is dominated by labour market intermediaries and employers who are better informed and connected than they are. They are in need of support to reduce their vulnerability but are unlikely to be in a position to pay for or be willing to pay for services on a full cost recovery basis immediately. The services provided will enable them to access better jobs and reduce the level of uncertainty and harassment that they face in the job market. This model had criticised on the ground of provision for higher subsidy which is economically unsuitable in the long term. However Deshingkar argued that critics under-estimate the time that it takes to attract poor, risk-averse and uneducated workers into contributory schemes. While industrial worker costs may be borne by industry other poorer workers who migrate on a free lance basis and switch jobs rapidly may require more support.

4.4.2 The Market Based Approach

The Market Based Approach works with existing labour market patterns and offers services on a cost recovery basis. An example of such an approach is the initiative launched by Samarthan, an NGO and the World Bank funded District Poverty Initiatives Project (DPIP) in Madhya Pradesh called mazdoor.org. This will
provide skills enhancement and certification programmes, advice and information on jobs and help workers to link up with government schemes on insurance and workers funds. They intend to work within the existing structure of industry and the labour market i.e. recognise that capital and labour are highly mobile and that capital/industry locates itself where cheap labour can be accessed. They also recognise that a majority of industrial workers are not named on the employment registers of industries and are recruited by intermediaries who are not accountable to anyone under the law. Mazdoor.org will create a proposition that is acceptable to industry by taking on the responsibility for the welfare of the workers even though it is the responsibility of the industry and employers under law. For this they plan to make industry pay services charges.

4.4.3 The Labour Union Model

The Labour Union Model is rights based approach and works for better implementation of labour laws and regulation of labour flows. Some NGOs like (Sudrak in Rajasthan and Disha in Gujarat) believe that unionising migrant workers will go a long way towards realising their rights, improving their bargaining power in the market and prevent exploitation. The Aajeevika Bureau established by Sudrak for example has set up a union of migrant workers who work in cotton fields. One of the main objectives of the union is to regulate the supply of labour because they feel that an excess supply situation lowers the bargaining power of the migrant. They have enrolled over 1500 “mates” and the Union has put out a charter of demands. It has set up around 16 manned check points at all the border crossings between Gujarat and Rajasthan. As a result, employers have offered a partial hike in wage rates and negotiations are continuing. A similar approach has been adopted by the Bandhкам Majoor Sangathan (BMS) established by DISHA in
Ahmedabad. Both Sudrak and DISHA are also engaged in policy advocacy for the amendment of the Inter State Migrant Workmen Act, 1979 which they argue is unimplementable in its current form.

4.4.4 The Rehabilitation Model

It was commonly believed that forced migration or trafficking where workers are lured on false promises, often borrow money from recruitment agents which they repay through punishing work schedules, their movement is restricted at the work site and wages are well below the legal minimum. In addition women and children are also exploited in various ways and living conditions are appalling. These models offer much promise, but for many types of challenge faced by migrants, a combination will be needed of these kinds of support together with changes in (or better enforcement of) government legislation, and in some cases more information will be required on migrants’ needs. Therefore its need to reform legislation related to food, housing, health, education and social security so that migrant workers can access schemes when ‘migrant for diversified destination. The best example of rehabilitation model carry out by Action Aid with brick kiln workers in Orissa and Andhra Pradesh. Action Aid conducts raids on brick kilns together with the police to release bonded migrant workers and rehabilitate them.

4.5 Migrants Related Labour Laws

Despite Inter State Migrant Workmen (Regulation and Conditions of Service) Act 1979, not a single labour law is directly associated with the migrant workforce. Though, different labour laws also protect the interest of migrant worker. For example, Minimum Wage Act 1948, ensures the subsistence wage and dignified life; Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act 1970, controlled for hires and fire strategy of employees; Equal Remuneration Act 1976, provides protection against any discrimination; Bonded Labour Act
1976 and Child Labour Act 1986, prohibits and regulates for Bandhua Majadoor system and child trafficking from the remote areas; Building and Other construction Workers Act 1996, regulates the employment and condition of services; and more recent, Unorganised Workers Social Security Act 2008 focuses on the migrant as well non-migrant workers problems for diversified dimension.

Inter State Migrant Workmen (Regulation and Conditions of Service) Act 1979 is important for inter-state migration, which completely deals with the illegal or immoral practices in recruitment for migrant workers. This Act is applicable only for those workers who got jobs through contractors and organisation that provide jobs more than five contract workers. The Act tackles to industrial disputes between migrant worker and employee and provides legal help at destination as well as their native states. However, regarding the poor implementation of labour laws, Srivastava and Sasi Kumar (2003) argued, “migrants related labour laws fails because regulatory authorities are over-stretched; the state sees migrants as a low priority by and migrant workers are weak and vulnerable with little support from civil society. It seems to act like the Inter State Migrant Workman Act remains by and large without teeth”. During the field survey in Saharsa, it observed that migrant’s labour rights are not protected due to poor implementations of above prescribed labour laws. There are diverse kinds of nuisance reported out to migrant workers by the police, postal department, private courier agent, legal or illegal owners of slums dweller, shopkeepers and labour contractors at destination as well as returning back to their native place.

4.6 Bihar Rural Livelihoods Programme (BRLP)

The Bihar Rural Livelihoods Project (BRLP) is community driven project (which is sponsored by the World Bank) of the Government of Bihar for the alleviation of poverty, to provide right
and equal opportunities for livelihoods for rural community especially poor. The ‘Bihar Rural Livelihoods Project (BRLP)’ will be executed by the Bihar Rural Livelihoods Promotion Society, a semi-autonomous society established under the Department of Finance of GOB and function since 2007. Bihar Rural Livelihoods Promotion Society under the overall Framework of National Rural Livelihoods Mission to scale up the JEEVIKA model of poverty alleviation throughout the all 534 blocks of 38 districts of Bihar in a phased manner. BRLPS through the Bihar Rural Livelihoods Project (BRLP) aims to improve rural livelihood options and works towards social and economic empowerment of the rural poor and women. The major role of the development professionals BRLPS as promote institution and capacity building, social development, microfinance and livelihoods.

Furthermore, JEEVIKA is dynamically engaged in helping to get better wages and working and living conditions of migrant labourers; and, to improve the credit facility to migrant workers in the native place, protect their entitlements and to develop these areas so as to curtail distress migration. JEEVIKA also promotes market-linked skills enhancement and placement of Bihari migrant workers though renowned companies In the near future JEEVIKA will be played same role as GVT in Madhya Pradesh like opening of migrant resource centre at block level. This resource centre provide subsidised service like issuing identity card, building a data base of migrants, with respect to their destination, income, and name of employment provider or contractor information about employment opportunities, right awareness, skill enhancement training courses, dispute settlement services and to secure proper implementation of labour laws. However, JEEVIKA scheme of government of Bihar addresses the migrant labour problem in some pilot district, yet this ambitious scheme in Saharsa, at lower bound of priority. Therefore, rural
migrant labour of Saharsa district, have been not got any incentive related to migration problem.

4.7 Impact of Welfare Schemes on the migration in the Saharsa District

4.7.1 MGNREGA

“NREGA... [Should help] in reducing the number of migrant labourers in the country as employment is being provided to them in their own villages”.

Mallikarjun Kharge, Indian Labour Minister, The Economic Times, 2010

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) is the flagship welfare programme of the UPA government, which assures legal guarantee for 100 days job in a year for each rural labour household. One of its main objectives is to control labour migration through the provision of non-mechanical of locally available work in rural areas. But some successes for preventive check to labour migration in the Bihar, the programme has not influence migration phenomenon in the Saharsa. Drèze and Khera and by the India School of Women’s Studies and Development highlights that NREGA leads to decreases in distress migration from villages, with workers stating preference to work in and around their villages, rather than bearing the social and other costs of migrating elsewhere in search of work (NCEUIS 2009: 220, 223). In fact is hopeful that “programmes have made a significant contribution in not only enhancing income levels of the poor, but have been helpful in stemming the rural and urban migration of the poor also” NCEUSI (2009: 251).

According to government data, recent independent studies and the Indian media, Solinski (2012) argues that NREGA’s limited impact, partly stems from a misconception of labour migration – as a
poverty ‘problem’ and as merely a product of ‘push-and-pull’ economic factors, and its failure – like many other ‘development’ programmes – to recognise the poor’s ‘capacity to aspire’. NREGA has benefitted those with little or no access to positive migration opportunities, especially Scheduled Castes and Tribes, in other words, it may be a good way to control distress migration, which is admirable. However, it is unlikely to succeed in reducing mobility for work in general – which is not desirable anyway. The present objectives are improving the conditions of migrants and support to their aspiration rather than curtail migration.

**Table No. 4.1: Total Job Day Provide Under MGNREGA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Job Days</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-migrant Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

It is claimed by big landlords, manufacture and construction contractor about the shortage of labour in the Punjab, Haryana and under NCR area and declining trend of supply of labour from Bihar as well other parts of the country due to MGNREGA. However, during the field visit, it found that performance MGNREGA is not well. Under no any households found permanent returned migrant labour or even distress migration is not retarding in this region due to less job
availability in MGNREGA. The region behind the paradox of shortage of labour and ineffective of MGNREGA to curb migration is due to changing economic, political scenarios of Bihar. In the recent 6 to 7 years, Bihar GDP growth rate was top among the Indian states, which sustain growing from 10 to 12 per cent. This is result of the boost in the construction sector, transportation and agriculture (second green revolution scheme) which absorb labour force. There is also decreased in the wage differential between interstate, intrastate and intra district migrant place. Therefore, it leads to shift in the destination of migration as interstate to intrastate and intra district migration at the nearest urban place. This fact is also supported by the data obtained from field survey.

Table No. 4.1 shows that distribution of total number of MGNREGA job days in a year, for migrant and non-migrant rural labours. Though, non-migrant labour got comparative more job days under the MGNREGA scheme than migrant labour. But it is not significant for surviving. During the field survey, each of the respondents said that they have job card, but got less of the job days as prescribed in the MGNREGA scheme. They also blame that most of the work take place with the help of JBC machine which is against the MGNREGA directives. Therefore, these mechanical activities reduced the job opportunity. These workers also claimed for less payment of MGNREGA wage relative to legal provision of wage. Out of 5 villages only 2 villages Mokana and Ethari, perform some creative work under MGNREGA like digging of ponds and construction of Kaccha road. About 92 percent of migrant labours were not found any job day. Whereas, 64 percent of non-migrant labours was not found a single job day. Distribution of job day is not uniform, but according to connivances of the head of the Panchayat (Mukiya). During the field survey, it has been noticed that minimum working day in year 10 days
and while maximum working day as 23 days in a year. It shows that the performance and implementation of the MGNREGA is very weak and associated with so many leakages. In this scheme, labour suffers from delay in payment by the complicated procedures and under wage payment due to presence of corrupted employee in the block and contractor or local politician. It is also seen that without a single work on the ground, the master card was maintained on paper as total work day and withdrawal sanction money. And this corruption few migrant labours also involved with panchayat representative as they only registered and gets payment of ₹ 200 to ₹ 300 without indulging in any work activity. Therefore MGNREGA did not influence the migration decision due to less employment opportunity and less wage level than wage given at migrant place.

4.7.2 Contribution of Public Distribution System for Migrant Household

In the democratic state like India, poverty, malnutrition and food security all are big challenges for the government. In this context, Public Distribution System plays an important role in welfare economy. PDS is part of the safety net system, which provides rationed amounts of basic food items (rice, wheat, sugar, edible oils, etc.) and other non-food products (kerosene, coal, cloth, etc.) at subsidized prices to consumers through a network of fair price shops. In India, up to 1997, the PDS was universal and all households, rural and urban, with a registered residential address were entitled to rations. In fact, the objective of maintaining price stability is crucial in the post-liberalization period when the market has been free for private agent and international price fluctuations can more easily affect domestic prices.
Table No. 4.2: Distribution of Ration Card

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ration card</th>
<th>Migrant Household</th>
<th>Non-migrant Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Antyodaya</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, BPL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, APL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*

The prime objective of PDS to secured price stabilization through transfer of cereals from surplus to deficit area and prevents hunger and malnutrition. In the context of widespread malnutrition and inflation in food prices, access to basic foods at reasonable prices remains an important policy intervention. Migrant households face critical entitlement problem of ration food at the both origin and destination place. At the migrant place, none of the respondent of migrant labour got to subsidised ration from the public distribution system or any other government institutes. At the origin place lot of discrimination and cheating against migrant households by the dealer of fair price ration shop. Often they got less of subsidised rations as legal entitlement for Antyodaya and the BPL card holder. However, non-migrant households of labour also suffer from this problem, but less extent as compare to the migrant households.

Table No. 4.2 notes that migrant households excluded from PDS relatively higher than non-migrant households. The non-possession of ration cards throughout migrant and non-migrant households as 14 and 6 percent respectively. Distribution of Antyodaya and BPL cards, biased towards non-migrant households as 30 and 56 percent. Whereas, migrant households have 18 and 44 percent Antyodaya and BPL cards respectively. Migrant households possess 24 per cent of APL card while only 6 per cent of non-migrant
households have an APL card. APL card is meaningless in the rural area because off take of food grain is less and higher price. Hence, this study finds that lack of safety net for food security caused migration and emergent needs for removing this discrimination.

4.7.3 Indira Awaas Yojana in Saharsa

The Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) is a flagship scheme of the Ministry of Rural Development to provide housing to below poverty line (BPL) families in the rural areas. Under IAY, w.e.f. 1.4.2013, a BPL family is given grant of ₹ 70000/- for new construction in plain areas and ₹ 75,500/- for construction in hilly/difficult areas. In addition, the IAY beneficiary is also eligible to avail loan up to ₹ 20,000 per housing unit at an interest rate (DRI) of 4 percent per annum. Further, IAY funds can also be utilized for upgradation of a kutcha house for which a subsidy of ₹ 15,000/- per unit is provided. The funding of IAY is shared between the Centre and States in the ratio of 75:25 respectively. In the case of North-Eastern States and Sikkim, funding shares in the ratio of 90:10. In the case of UTs, entire funds for IAY are provided by the Centre. Starting from 2013-14, w.e.f. 1.4.2013 Govt. has also approved providing 4 percent of funds to State Governments for administrative expenses on IAY scheme, (Ministry of Rural Development).

**Figure No. 4.2 Basic Amenities Provided by Government in Saharsa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Migrant Households</th>
<th>Non-migrant Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House (IAY)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health card</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2013*
Figure No. 4.2 shows that the beneficiary of IAY is higher in the non-migrant household relative to migrant households. Under IAY scheme, 82 percent of non-migrant households have been allotted house while 60 percent of migrant households get benefited. The lack of housing influence the migration decision, generally in the villages under Kosi embankment area and village situated parallel to the Kosi River in the lower area of Saharsa. Where, rehabilitation problem often occurs due to regular intervention of flood. However, all of the eligible and benefited respondent give a positive view for IAY but also complain about illegal activity like demand for a bribe by Block officers and head/ Mukhya of Panchayat. The average bribe indulges in per sanction of the IAY, between ranges of ₹ 4000 to ₹ 5000. Therefore, IAY policy is less effective for migration decision.

4.7.4 Rastriya Swasthya Bima Yojana in Saharsa

Ministry of labour and employment, Government of India has launched a health insurance scheme for BPL families. Under the Rastriya Swasthya Bima Yojana, there is provision for hospitalisation expenses up to ₹ 30000 per households. There is also provision of transportation cost up to ₹ 1000 in a year with ₹ 100 per visit. Under the scheme of free medical treatment as a result of health insurance policy, public or private insurance company whose agreement with state government the labour minister said, all medical colleges and government hospitals have been attached. Appealing all the health hubs to behave politely with the smart card holders and the labour department would reward the hospitals with encouragement money. The government initiated with the scheme for the rural poor in the systematic manner to control the unprecedented health hazardous problem.

In the Saharsa district 15 private hospitals linked with RSBY scheme, but beneficiary households is negligible due to lack of
information about the utilisation of health smart card and also often health service denied by these hospitals. During the field survey, all BPL respondents said that they have a health smart card. But the utilisation of smart cards had less effective in the sever health situation of their family member. Figure No. 4.2 shows that distribution of health smart cards biased against migrant households. As 86 percent of non-migrant households covered in the RSBY scheme while only 62 percent of migrant households. Hence this health insurance scheme does not influence the decision in the migration.

4.7.5 Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan in Saharsa

Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan is extension of Total Sanitation Campaign and creating positive outcomes with the Nirmal Gram Panchayats. The XIIth five year plans accelerate the sanitation facility in the rural areas. It widened the scope of incentive for making individual households latrine to All BPL and APL households of SCs, STs, small and marginal farmers, landless labour with homestead land, physical handicapped and female headed. Financial incentive for the construction of toilets has been raised for all eligible beneficiaries to ₹ 4600/- from the earlier amount of ₹ 3200/- under NBA. In addition, up to ₹ 4500/- can be spent under Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme for construction of the toilet. Along-with beneficiary contribution of ₹ 900/-, the total amount of ₹ 10000/- is now available for construction of toilets, which in the case of hilly and difficult areas is ₹ 10500/-. (Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation)

However, implementation of the Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan didn't succeed due to deficient information and communication activities, lack of community participation and proper monitoring in Saharsa. The performance of total sanitation is very weak in the
sample villages due to lack of interest shown by the Panchayat leader in the fund utilisation. During the field survey, it observed that not a single household have latrines or toilet facility. Lack of the latrine facility creates not only the adverse impact on the health, but more sensitive for security concerns about women member. Aspiration of respectful life without proper sanitation is not possible, therefore comparative higher status of labour households make latrine at own effort. It means the demonstration effect occurs in the other labour households, but their financial condition is not a position to build up latrine at own expense.

4.7.6 National Rural Drinking Water Programme in the Saharsa

Rural Water Supply has traditionally focused on extending coverage to rural areas in order to provide ‘safe’ quality of water and service. Water is a State subject and rural water supply has been included in the Eleventh Schedule of the Constitution among the subjects that may be entrusted to Panchayats by the States. The Eleventh Plan identifies the major issues that need tackling during this period as the problem of sustainability, water availability and supply, poor water quality, centralized vs. decentralized approaches and financing of O&M cost while ensuring equity in regard to gender, socially and economically weaker sections of the society, school children, socially vulnerable groups such as pregnant and lactating mothers, specially disabled senior citizens etc. In order to address the above issues, the rural water supply programme and guidelines have been revised w.e.f. 1.4.2009 as the National Rural Drinking Water Programme (NRDWP).

During the field survey, it was observed that Saharsa has abundant of water source and ground water is normal (16 to 30 fit). Out of five sample villages, only one village has water purification plant. Iron contaminated water is more in the village which is situated
near Kosi River and its branch. Therefore often most of people affected from iron contaminated water borne diseases like dysentery (loose motion), cracking of bone and teeth. In this context, Bihar government initiated the Hand Pump Scheme for individual BPL households to access pure drinking water regarding the NRDWP obligation. Hand Pump Scheme is not successful in the Saharsa due to less distribution of hand pump between migrant and non-migrant households as 4 and 6 percent respectively. Regarding the provision of safe drinking water, it was found that less of comparative advancement between both types of the households. Therefore provision of safe drinking water does not influence the migration decision.

4.8 Conclusion

Rural migrant labours of Saharsa district do often not claim for legal provisions under Interstate Migrant Labour Act, 1979 or other labour laws due to unawareness, unavailability of dispute resettlement organisation and migrant resource centre. They are also excluded in the migrant support programme like JEEVIKA scheme. However, evidences from field survey suggest that migrant households were discriminated in most of the schemes like MGNREGA, Food Security Act PDS, IAY, RSBY, NBA and NRDWP due to local politics. Therefore, these schemes do not act in a way to check mass migration.

*****
Chapter - V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

“The Villagers want Bread - not Butter and Disciplined Work, some work that will supplement their agricultural avocations which do not go on for all the 12 Months”

Mahatma Gandhi 8

5.1 Conclusion

This study has examined the effects of migration on rural labour households at origin by meso-level approach, which compromised the role of individual labour, family, social institutions, structure of the economy and environment in the migration process. The demand for cheap labour from construction and manufacturing sectors in urban areas is continuously increasing. The rural economy of Saharsa district has failed to provide jobs more than an average of two or three days. As a result of migration from rural to urban took place. After the neo-liberalisation of the Indian economy, agro-capital concentrated on western green field. Therefore, rural to rural migration trend is attracting to the migrants towards itself due to agriculture-wage differential. However, Saharsa district connected with the major destinations with help of development for better connectivity of railway network in the recent decade. As a result, a composite pattern of migration i.e. rural to rural and rural to urban seasonal migration trend came out, which assist the migrants to sustain their livelihoods and strong culture norms of this region.

8Grameen Bharat (2009), News Letter published by Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, Volume 8, Issue 57, p.5)
Economic and social impacts of migration on migrant households may be positive and negative. Migration changed the social, political and economic structure of rural Saharsa. It has been found in the present study that social-economic status of rural labour households is lower at the origin. Migrants also play a minimal role in the community decision making process. It is not an easy task to distinguish the social status of migrant and non-migrant households because of the head of non-migrant labour household belongs to an older age group, who is involved in the most of community decisions regarding social economic activities. Whilst head of migrant households is comparatively younger and away from the community decision making process. Therefore, in the rural society, migrant households are treated as less important as compared to non migrant household.

The labour society reflects the male dominated or paternal supremacy. In both the types of migrants and non-migrants households, women participate only in agriculture activities. Besides, society does not allow the women to do works on construction sites or outside village. As a head of family, female members play an important role for managing the received remittances in a rational way. Their decision-making autonomy also increased in the absence of migrant male member. However, in some cases, seasonal migration increased the risk of family breakdown, breakup of social relation and emotional stress. Though, female of non migrant household got more freedom as compared to migrant household in the context of work participation. Because of the attitude of male migrant has been changed as they prohibited their wives to work on the others agriculture fields. The more adverse effect of migration is that the female members of migrant households feel insecure at their native place because of their young male members are often absent from the
village. Another big problem associate with child labour, which is higher in the migrant households comparative to non-migrant households. Caste factor plays leading role in determining their social status. The most of the labours belong to backward caste in both the types of households. Therefore, on the ground of caste factor at most all labour households have lower status in the society without bifurcation of migrant or non-migrant households. However, it has been found that the mobility of poor forward caste labours also increased.

In the study, it has been noticed that migration is not affected by education level. Because the less skilled labours are required to do work for lowest paid jobs at destinations. Therefore, education levels of migrant labours are relatively lower than non-migrant labours. Rural labour households of this region suffer from educational backwardness. However, the literacy rate of non-migrant households is marginally higher than migrant households at 43.19 and 42.27 per cent respectively. On the other side, the illiteracy rate of migrant households is higher than migrant households at 28.27 and 26.31 per cent respectively. One of the important changes in the rural society has found that redefinition of landlord-labour relationship, but it’s remaining in semi-feudal structure.

Economic status of migrant households is higher than non-migrant households in terms of per capita monthly income, housing structure, land distribution, assets (other than land) distribution and debt level. Migration is considered as an optimistic process for the livelihood and development of their family. Remittances seem to the backbone for the migrant households and create multiplier effects in the local economy. Remittance is substituted for home production and main source of income for migrant households, who live at origin. Remittance increases household income, reduces depth and severity of
poverty and acts as insurance during uncertainties and the days of hardships like floods etc. Remittance is sent by migrant labours not in a homogeneous way. Remittance varied with the total number of migrants of the household and pattern of migration according to their needs. This has been found in the study that migrant labours belong to rural to urban and composite pattern of migration remit more remittance than rural to rural migrant labours despite of higher propensity of saving at rural destination. The reason behind variation of remittance due to different nature of job, skill, higher months of migration and number of migrant labours in different households. Therefore, one of the important trends occur in the seasonal migrants as a composite pattern for earning more.

This study has also been focused on the different productive investments at origin by migrants. Regarding the investment strategy, it has been found that remittance about 58 per cent of households purchased homestead land in terms of area less than one Katha. While only 22 per cent of households purchased less than one Bigha of agricultural land. Further, this study concludes that investment of homestead land not influenced by number of migrant labours. But investment in agriculture land depends on the number of migrant labour of the household. The observation from field survey highlighted that migrants showed the first priority of investment of remittance in the homestead land, then in the construction or maintenances of the house. About 48 percent of migrant households have invested in the construction or maintained of house. A very few migrant households are found who are interested in purchasing the conspicuous or luxury goods like jewellery, television and motorcycle due to higher cost of these commodities and beyond his purchasing capacity.
It has been found a paradox of income distribution for migrant and non-migrant households. On one hand, within the migrant households income inequality decreased 63 per cent from 0.52787 to 0.19575 in terms of Gini Coefficient. It reflects that migration occurs not only in the extreme poor prone labours, but significant proportion of the labour that have relative more income source at origin. Though, income inequality within the migrant households as well as non-migrant household is more or less equal despite of the slightly difference as 0.00401. However, income inequality between overall rural labour households (0.23868) is comparatively higher than within migrant and non-migrant households as 22 and 24 percent respectively. On the other hand, the overall effect of migration increase the income inequality between migrant and non-migrant rural labour households across villages. Hence it has been proved from the study that migration accelerates the income differential between migrant and non-migrant households and leads to improvement in income distribution within migrant households. In some cases, it is found that an adequate remittance flow alone cannot cause significant changes– smoothly functioning local level institutions and policy interventions are needed as well.

At the micro level, this study also supports that the wage differential between destination and origin is the main cause of migration. Agriculture wage provides at destination in the range of ₹ 350 and 450 whereas at origin provide in the range of ₹ 50 to 100. Non-farm wage level is also significantly higher at the destination place than that of at origin. For example, unskilled and skilled migrant worker got wage in the range of ₹ 200 to 350 and ₹ 351 to 450 respectively in the construction sector. Whereas, unskilled and skilled non-migrant worker, got wage in the range of ₹ 160 to 250 and ₹ 300 to 400 respectively in the construction sector. However, non-farm
The wage level at origin is impressive but not provides regular job opportunity more than two to three days due to backwardness of economic infrastructure of rural Saharsa.

As far as wage distribution is concerned, this study has been noticed that wage inequality within migrant labour is less than non-migrant labour in terms of Gini Coefficient 0.10793 and 0.22326 respectively. The reason behind less inequality within migrant labour is nearly homogeneous wage rate and availability of work in same nature at the destination. Similarly, it found relatively higher wage inequality within non-migrant labour, due to wage rate differential in agriculture, non-skilled and skilled construction sectors at the origin. Hence, it is found in this study that there is less impact of migration on the wage inequality. Despite slightly increased in the overall wage inequality between migrant and non-migrant labour by 0.22866.

It has been evident from the present study that migration seeks to disequilibrium situation of the labour market. Migration will cause labour to become less scarce at the destination and scarcer at the sending end. Regarding, capital will expect to move in the opposite direction. In a perfectly neo-classical world, the process of “factor price equalization” (Heckscher-Ohlin model) will eventually result in the growing convergence between wages at the sending and receiving end (Harris and Todaro 1970; Lewis 1954; Ranis and Fei 1961; Haas, 2008). This similar kind of convergence processes of wage also occurs in the rural economy of Saharsa district. Therefore, the wage level becomes double in all sectors. Particularly, agriculture wage level is affected directly by the migration, whereas wage level in construction sector increased by recent growth of infrastructure activities like making road and bridge. Though the wage level in construction sector also indirectly influenced by the composite pattern of migration in which increased the duration period in a year and created labour
problem even off agriculture season. However, agriculture wage is not uniform in the agrarian economy within Saharsa district and differ from one village to another. The agriculture wage of villages situated under Kosi embankment area is lower than other part of Saharsa district due to the high intensity of semi-feudal structure and less connectivity to other parts. Despite, high migration rate of rural to rural migration (which causes shortage of labour) from village of Kosi embankment area than other villages, it is the paradox of stagnant low wage rate.

However, there are no any universal policies for direct linkage with internal migration. Government of Bihar initiates the Jeevika scheme for addressing migrant labour problem, but still this important scheme not introduced in Saharsa. This study has also been found that welfare schemes like MGNREGA, PDS, IAY, RSBY, NBA and NRDWP not in a condition to directly or indirectly carve the problems of migration due to poor implementation and higher discrimination against migrant households.

Migration is also considered as a pessimistic process in terms of food, housing, health and social security at destination. At the destination, migrants suffer from hygienic and sanitation factors which adversely affect on their health and work efficiency. Migrants often face worse working condition and difficulties at the destination place by the political wing from native people due to fear of shortage of jobs, different culture and identity crisis. The migrants do not only face risks at the destination place, but also their family members also bear several risks associated with forgery, counterfeiting, cheating etc.

5.2 Suggestions

District Saharsa has witnessed to migrant the people in a very large numbers in all over India. Migration has improved the social, economic conditions of migrant labour households at certain extent.
Migrants are in marginally better position as compared to non-migrant labour households. Therefore, aspiration or probability of migration continues to increase in the bottom section of labour households. Migrant support strategy must be designed with the lesson from Gramin Vikas Trust (GVT), Aajeevika Bureau, Madhya Pardesh Rural Livelihood Project (MPRLP) as Bihar Rural Livelihood Project (BRLP) projected to run in all districts of Bihar. Jeevika must be launched soon for opening of block level community recourse centre for migrant, where they got the identity card, information base about jobs, skill development training, bargaining strength & awareness about the union and heath risk at destination. Often migrants are victimized from the labour-employee disputes. Therefore, it is the need of hour that there should be enforcement of the Inter State Labour Act and make sure the proper functions of provision made in the un-organized sector bill like social security, compensation norms, health issues etc. In order to protect migrant as well non-migrant’s labour interest at the origin place more rigorous policies are needed.

5.2.1 To Improve Infrastructure of Rural Economy

District Saharsa has been enriched of agriculture land and the waterlogged area, which has huge potential to accelerate the growth for agriculture based industry like jute, makhana and maize processing unit in villages near the east embankment of Kosi. These industries increase not only the income and employment, but also sustaining diversified livelihood strategy in their native economy. Floods and uneven land distribution are major constraints for the development of trade and labour market. These problems can be resolved with the help of appropriate and efficient land management, water management through watershed approach and public investment. At the very outset an efficient flood control mechanism should be developed with the help of government of Bihar and Nepal. Second, the land settlement
policy of redistribution and reclamation must be in favour of agriculture and marginal labour. These strategies need to be accompanied by changes that improve the poor’s access to land, to common property resources, social and physical infrastructure, and to governance institutions.

In addition, there should be enhance the role of district, rural development agencies which play major planning, implementation and monitoring for all rural development schemes at district level. Therefore, ministry of rural development should become forward and assures the catalyst's role of District Rural Development Agencies. As far as economic development of rural people, which aims at bridging the rural, urban divide by guaranteeing wage employment and ensuring food security, providing for economic upliftment by self employment, creating rural infrastructure, providing for dignified living through rural housing, drinking water and sanitation schemes and restoring lost or depleted productivity of the land. In this regard DRDAs must be checked the performance of MGNREGA activity. These programmes have been rationalized, restructured and revamped from time to time with a view to enhance their efficacy and impact. DRDAs must be linked with the migration and development strategy of the rural economy of origin as recommendations made by the National Commission on Rural labour (1991) and National Commission on Labour (2002).

5.2.2 To Secure Basic Entitlement Schemes

Majority of seasonal migrant labour household excluded from welfare schemes of government at origin as well destination place. Basically, at the survival level migrants face the food, shelter, school, education, health, sanitation and drinking water. Therefore, access to food, education, shelter and heath schemes should be transferable and trading between origin and destination place.
5.2.3 To Increase Credit Facility and Banking Institutions

This study has found that most of marginal migrant labour belongs to backward classes. Therefore, regarding the capital problem, it should be increased the micro finance, strategy, through State Channelizing Agencies (SCAs) or Self Help Groups (SHGs) by National Backward Classes development and Finance Corporation. Under this scheme credit should provide for skill development and self employment ventures. On the other hand, for providing credit facility, role NGO must be increased e.g. CARE-India. Most importantly, credit facility for migrant as well non-migrant labour should be provided without any discrimination. Migrants often face difficulties in sending remittances due to lack of banking institutions in the rural area. Migrant households also paid the higher transaction cost on receiving remittance from the private network channel. Therefore, take the help of establishments of new bank branch or their corresponding services through private agency.

5.2.4 To Modernize the Panchayat Raj System

Panchayats should play major role in the development of migrant households. At first, they should ensure the transparent system for relevant records of migrants labour by ‘e-data bank’. Panchayats should issue and verifies the identity card, pass book and employment detail at regular interval. Further, it should encourage the communication services like ‘e-chopal’. This system should also recognise the vulnerable migrant household and priorities in welfare schemes. The thrust of suggestions is that both governmental and non-governmental intervention should support migrant labourers and pro-poor development as vigorously as possible. This would influence not only condition of migrants and the pattern of migration, but also the pattern of development that sustains these patterns of migration.
To conclude, migration has played a positive role in the economic upliftment of many households in Saharsa district. They have gained in terms of per capita monthly income, housing structure, land distribution and debt level. If the government of Bihar gives especial attention to Saharsa district migrant population then definitely this district will see a better tomorrow.
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