# Socio-Economic Conditions of the Migrant Labour in Mahabubnagar District: A Study

## K. Ailaia[1] and P. Saidul[2]

[1]Asst.Prof of Sociology, Department Kakatiya University Warangal.
[2]Department of Sociology, Kakatiya University Warangal.
Email: saidulsociology@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

*Every community has its own way to meet its basic needs for the existence of its members, failing which they are threatened with extinction. Nature here comes forward and joins hands with them to fulfill their needs fashioned, of course in their own way depending on their customs, traditions, demographic structures etc. owing to this people with the same natural surroundings have developed different economic process to meet the needs. "Economic organization is a type of social action. It involves the combination of various kinds of the human services with one another and with non-women goods, in such a way that they serve given ends".*
*Key words: Socio-economic Condition, Labour, traditions*

## INTRODUCTION

Economic organization consists of the ordering and organization of human relations and human efforts in order to procure as many of the necessities of day-to day life as possible with the expenditure of minimum efforts. It is attempted to secure the maximum satisfaction possible through adapting limited means to unlimited ends (needs) in own organized manner. All societies have structured arrangements to provide the material means individual and community life. It is these structured rules that we call an economic system.

In this present paper study of the economic conditions are understood as the means by which goods are produced, distributed and consumed. This paper also deals with how the labourer solves their problems of getting their live hood within the limitations of their resources, land capital and technology and distribute goods according to their own priorities.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this section, apart from presenting literature on migration theories, the study also presents literature in relation to seasonal or circular migration. There are several migration theories which discuss the migration process and its economic implications. Theory of migration talks about the dual economy comprising the subsistence agricultural sector characterised by surplus labour and unemployment / underemployment and the modern industrial sector characterised by full employment. In the modern sector, wages are maintained at levels much higher than the average wage in agriculture sector. This theory says in the case of individual utility maximisation, the decision to migrate to cities would be determined by wage differentials, plus the expected probability of obtaining employment at the destination.

Ishtiaque, (2011) studied that both rural poor and non-poor migrate to urban areas examined that the process of rural-urban migration is strongly influenced by the incidence of push factors, while found that migration is influenced by both push and pull factors. According to PEST factors (Political, Economic, Social and Technological) people are more likely to move and he showed that people from south-eastern and north-eastern part are less likely to move to major industrial cities.

Ratha, *et al.*, (2011) in her study migration is a decision that impacts the welfare of the household, the home community, and in the end the whole economy in various ways. Both the international and internal migration will work in the same way. The welfare implications of the international

migration on the origin country are more often positive and sizable. However, we need ample literature to judge whether the welfare implications of the temporary rural to urban migration is positive and sizable in the context of rural development. Compare to international migration, still it is peripheral to generalize the findings of rural to urban migration on community development.

Deshingkar, *et al.,* (2009) argued that a majority of the seasonal migrants, many of whom are SCs and STs, are poor, and for them migration is a household strategy for managing risk where one or more members of family go away from the village to find work, and that this is a central part of their livelihoods. Whether or not seasonal migration is a coping strategy or becomes more accumulative, depends on a number of factors including improved work availability, rising wages, cutting out intermediaries, and improving skills.

Rokib (2009) studied the socio-economic and demographic consequences of migration based on sample surveys, while he discussed the migration objectives fulfillment of rural-urban migrants' based on case study. It has been found that rural-urban mi- grants are relatively better educated than the national population found that the rural migrants in the town are hard working and contribute significantly in daily life.

In his study, de Haan (2002) observed that migration is not a choice for poor people, but is the only option for survival after alienation from the land and exploitation in origin places. Hence, in developing countries, the largest proportion of migrants moves between rural and urban areas.

Krishnaiah (1997) studied on Mahabubnagar, otherwise better known as Palamur District, reveal that there are several systems of seasonal migration from the District where people migrate to engage in activities like private/public project work, construction, migration for agricultural work in irrigated areas and traditional stone crushing work, and this has been transformed over the years. For many of the poor living in the underdeveloped areas of Andhra Pradesh, wage work is very often the key means of livelihood and migration and commuting are the only ways of accessing the benefits of growth in other locations.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The Objectives of the Research Study are drawn as follows:
1. To know the social organizations of the migrant labour.
2. To study about the economic conditions of the Migrant Labourers.
3. To understand the problems of Migrant Labourers
4. To evaluate the social security of Migrant Labourers etc.

## METHODOLOGY

For the present paper, Mahabubnagar district has been selected to collect information pertain to research by using simple random sampling method. The researcher has taken only the migrants who are situated in different localities of the Mahabubnagar District. From each locality the head of the family was taken and later it was added up for all localities.

The paper reviews that migration from the village in essential seasonal and cyclical in nature and differs for both rural and urban migrants. Indeed, the main objective of the nature and characteristics of seasonal migrant households is that it is taking place for their survival and repayment of deaths.

The sample design consists of 300 respondents from Jadcharla, Makthal and Kalwakurthy mandals in Mahabubnagar district. 10 villages from each mandals and 10 respondents from each village were selected from the purpose of the study.

## DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANT RESPONDENTS BY AGE

For any sociological study the age is one of the important components. Therefore, it is intended to find out in our study to what age group our respondents belong. To analyse the age factor it is tried to categorise the respondents into five age groups in Table 1.

It is observed that the active age group is 36-45 years, so we can see that there are huge number of respondents who are highly migrated. The main reason is that the entire family members' welfare would be kept on the shoulder of this age group. In this aspect Makthal and Jadcharla Mandals are having the highest percentage of respondents (24.33 per cent) and lowest number of respondents

are from Kalwakurthy Mandal and whereas in the above category Kalwakurthy Mandal is occupying less number of respondents than the rest of the study area.

**Table 1:** Distribution of the Migrant Respondents by Age

| Name of the Mandal | Below 25 Years | 26 - 35 | 36- 45 | 46 - 55 | Above 55 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Jadcharla** | 16 (5.33) | 28 (9.33) | 38 (12.67) | 12 (4.00) | 06 (2.00) | **100 (33.33)** |
| **Maktal** | 18 (6.00) | 31 (10.34) | 35 (11.66) | 10 (3.33) | 06 (2.00) | **100 (33.33)** |
| **Kalwakurthy** | 15 (5.00) | 35 (11.67) | 26 (8. 67) | 16 (5.34) | 08 (2.66) | **100 (33.34)** |
| **Total** | **49 (16.33)** | **94 (31.34)** | **99 (33.00)** | **38 (12. 67)** | **20 (6.66)** | **300 (100.00)** |

(**Source**: Field Study, figures in brackets indicating Percentages)

## THE DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANT RESPONDENTS BY CASTE

For any sociological study the Caste is also one of the important components. Therefore, it is intended to study to find out the caste of respondents belongs to analyse the caste wise respondents into four categories as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2:** Distribution of Migrant Respondents by Caste

| Name of the Mandal | SC | ST | BC | OC | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jadcharla | 36 (12.00) | 12 (4.00) | 48 (16.00) | 04 (1.33) | **100 (33.33)** |
| Makthal | 32 (10.67) | 08 (2.67) | 54 (18.00) | 06 (2.00) | **100 (33.34)** |
| Kalwakurthy | 26 (8.67) | 14 (4.66) | 58 (19.33) | 02 (0.67) | **100 (33.33)** |
| **Total** | **94 (31.34)** | **34 (11.33)** | **160 (53.33)** | **12 (4.00)** | **300 (100.00)** |

(**Source:** Field Study, figures in brackets indicating Percentages)

Among all categories in 3 mandals, there are higher percentage (53.33 per cent) of respondents, i.e. out of 300 there are 160 belong to BC community. SCs are occupying 94 (31.34 percent) respondents next to BC community.

## THE DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANT RESPONDENTS BY RELIGION

For any sociological study the religion is also one of the important components. Therefore, it is intended to find out in our study the religion of respondents belong. To analyse the religion wise respondents into three groups as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3:** Distribution of Migrant Respondents by Religion

| Name of the Mandal | Hindu | Muslim | Christian | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Jadcharla** | 35 (11.67) | 28 (9.33) | 37 (12.33) | **100 (33.33)** |
| **Makthal** | 42 (14.00) | 31 (10.33) | 27 (9.00) | **100 (33.33)** |
| **Kalwakurthy** | 47 (15.67) | 27 (9.00) | 26 (8.67) | **100 (33.34)** |
| **Total** | **124 (41.34)** | **86 (28.66)** | **90 (30.00)** | **300 (100.00)** |

(**Source:** Field Study, figures in brackets indicating Percentages)

On the whole interestingly, we came to know that there are higher number of respondents (37) from Christian religion, 31 respondents from Muslim Religion, 47respondents are from the Hindu religion in Jadcharla, Makthal, Kalwakurthy Mandals respectively. The study also found that there are 124 (41.34 per cent) respondents from Hindu religion, 86 (28.66 percent) respondents from Muslim religion, 90 (30.00 per cent) respondents from Christian religion. On the whole there are higher number of respondents belong to Hindu religion in study area because majority of Indian people are belong to Hindu religion, so that there are higher number of people having poor economic background among Hindu religion according to population.

**Table 4:** Distribution of Migrant Respondents by Residence (After Migration)

| Sl. No. | Residential Place | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Bandameedipally | 28 | 9.33 |
| 2. | Bhoothpur Road | 32 | 10.67 |
| 3. | Dharmapur | 30 | 10.00 |
| 4. | Palakonda | 28 | 9.33 |
| 5. | Appannapally | 32 | 10.67 |
| 6. | Yenugonda | 34 | 11.34 |
| 7. | Srinivasa Colony | 18 | 6.00 |
| 8. | Padmavathi Colony | 22 | 7.33 |
| 9. | Shashabgutta | 20 | 6.67 |
| 10. | Mettugadda | 06 | 2.00 |
| 11. | Railway Gate | 24 | 8.00 |
| 12. | Kristinapally | 10 | 3.33 |
| 13. | New town | 06 | 2.00 |
| 14. | Habeebnagar | 07 | 2.33 |
| 15. | Clock Tower | 03 | 1.00 |
| | **Total** | **300** | **100.00** |

(**Source:** Field Study)

The above table presents the residential place of migrant respondents in Mahabubnagar town that out of 300 respondent 28 (9.33 per cent) respondents are in Bandameedipally, 32 (10.67 per cent) respondents are staying at Bhoothpur road side, 30 (10.00 per cent) respondents are in Dharmapur, 28 (9.33 per cent) respondents are in Palakonda, 32 (10.67 per cent) respondents are in Appannapally, 34 (11.34 per cent) respondents are in Yenugonda, 18 (6.00 per cent) respondents are in Srinivasa Colony, 22 (7.33 per cent) respondents are in Padmavathi Colony, 20 (6.67 per cent) respondents are in Shashabgutta, 6 (2.00 per cent) are in Mettugadda, 24 (8.00 per cent) respondents are at Railway Gate, 10 (3.33 per cent) respondents are in Kristianpally, 6 (2.00 per cent) respondents are in New town, 7 (2.33 per cent) respondents are in Habeeb Nagar and remaining 3 (1.00 per cent) respondents are staying at Clock Tower in Mahabubnagar District.

**Table 5:** Distribution of Land Owned Particulars of Respondents (At Native Place)

| Name of the Mandal | Land Less | Up to 1 Acre | 1.01 to 2 Acre | 2.01 to 3 Acre | 3.01 to 4 Acre | 4.01 to 5 Acre | 5 & above 5 Acres | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Jadcharla** | 28 (9.33) | 15 (5.00) | 31 (10.33) | 15 (5.00) | 04 (1.33) | 06 (2.00) | 01 (0.34) | **100 (33.33)** |
| **Makthal** | 36 (12.00) | 18 (6.00) | 22 (7.33) | 14 (4.67) | 05 (1.67) | 05 (1.67) | - | **100 (33.34)** |
| **Kalwakurthy** | 40 (13.34) | 09 (3.00) | 28 (9.34) | 11 (3.66) | 07 (2.33) | 04 (1.33) | 01 (0.33) | **100 (33.33)** |
| **Total** | **104 (34.67)** | **42 (14.00)** | **81 (27.00)** | **40 (13.33)** | **16 (5.33)** | **15 (5.00)** | **2 (0.67)** | **300 (100.00)** |

(**Source:** Field Study, figures in brackets indicating Percentages)

On the whole, the above table reveals that 104 (34.67 per cent) migrant families are didn't have the lands in their native place, followed by 42 (14 per cent) are up to 1 acre, 81 (27 per cent) are in 1.01 to 2.00 acres, 40 (13.34per cent) are 2.01 to 3.00 acres, 16 (5.33 per cent) are 3.01 to 4.00 acres, 15 (5 per cent) are in 4.01 to 5.00 acres and 2 (0.67 per cent) respondents are in above 5.00 acres in their native place respectively.

We can understand from this data that the higher number of respondents in landless category which may lead to migrate from rural to urban areas.

**Table 6:** Occupational Background of Migrant Respondents (After Migration)

| Sl. No. | Occupational Background | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|---------|-------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1. | Casual Labour | 81 | 27.00 |
| 2. | Business | 22 | 7.33 |
| 3. | Driving | 19 | 6.33 |
| 4. | Tailoring | 05 | 1.67 |
| 5. | Mechanic | 05 | 1.67 |
| 6. | Laundry | 10 | 3.33 |
| 7. | Watchman | 09 | 3.00 |
| 8. | Electrical Work | 06 | 2.00 |
| 9. | Vegetable Seller | 11 | 3.67 |
| 10. | Carpenter | 05 | 1.67 |
| 11. | Barber | 13 | 4.33 |
| 12. | Painter | 06 | 2.00 |
| 13. | Security Guards | 06 | 2.00 |
| 14. | Cement Work | 62 | 20.67 |
| 15. | Bricks Maker | 10 | 3.33 |
| 16. | Hamaly | 06 | 2.00 |
| 17. | Other Poultry | 04 | 1.33 |
| 18. | Other | 20 | 6.67 |
| **Total** | | **300** | **100.00** |

**Source:** Field Study

The above table describes that out of 300 respondents by occupation at place of migration, there are 81 (27.00 per cent) respondents are working as causal labour, 22 (7.33 per cent) respondents are business, 19 (6.33 per cent) respondents are driving, 5 (1.67 per cent) respondents are tailoring, 5 (1.67 per cent) respondents are mechanic, 10 (3.33 per cent) respondents are laundry, 9 (3.33 per cent) respondents are watchmen, 6 (2.00 per cent) respondents are doing electrical work, 11 (3.67 per cent) respondents are working as vegetable seller, 5 (1.67 per cent) respondents are carpenters, 13 (4.33 per cent) respondents are barbers, 6 (2.00 per cent) respondents are painter, 6 (2.00 per cent) respondents are working as security guards, 62 (20.67 per cent) respondents are working in cement work, 10 (3.33 per cent) respondents are bricks makers, 6 (2.00 per cent) respondents are working as hamaly, 4 (1.33 per cent) respondents are working in poultry and remaining 20 (6.67 per cent) respondents are working in other different works in their place of migration.

The table clearly shows that the highest 143 (47.67 per cent) migrant respondents in the place of migration working in cement work and as casual labour. The above table reveals the Income level distribution of the respondents are in Jadcharla Mandal, the highest number of 42 respondents accounting for 14.00 per cent are earned Rs. 4001-6000 per month, followed by 6001-8000 are 22 (7.33 per cent) respondents, Rs. 8001 and above are 16 (5.33 per cent)respondents and Rs. 2001-4000 are 14 (4.67 per cent)respondents. The lowest number of 6 respondents accounting for 2.00 per cent are earned Rs. up to 2000 respectively.

In Makthal Mandal, the highest number of 32 (10.67 per cent) respondents are earned money Rs. 4001-6000 per month, followed by 2001-4000 are 26 (8.67 per cent), Rs. 2001-4000 are 26 (8.67

per cent), 6001-8000 are 23 (7.67 per cent), upto 2000 are 10 (3.33 per cent) and 8001 and above are 9 respondents (3.00 per cent) respectively.

**Table 7:** Distribution of Respondents by Income Levels (Per Month, Before Migration)

| Name of the Mandal | Up to 2000 | 2001-4000 | 4001-6000 | 6001-8000 | 8001 & above | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jadcharla | 6 (2.00) | 14 (4.67) | 42 (14.00) | 22 (7.33) | 16 (5.33) | 100 (33.33) |
| Makthal | 10 (3.33) | 26 (8.67) | 32 (10.67) | 23 (7.67) | 09 (3.00) | 100 (33.34) |
| Kalwakurthy | 8 (2.67) | 28 (9.33) | 34 (11.33) | 21 (7.00) | 09 (3.00) | 100 (33.33) |
| **Total** | **24 (8.00)** | **68 (22.67)** | **108 (36.00)** | **66 (22.00)** | **34 (11.33)** | **300 (100.00)** |

(**Source:** Field Study, figures in brackets indicating Percentages)

In Kalwakurthy Mandal, the highest number of 34 (11.33 per cent) respondents are earned money Rs. 4001-600 per month, followed by 2001-4000 are 28 (9.33 per cent), 6001-8000 are 21 (7.00 per cent), 8001 and above are 9 (3.00 per cent) and upto 2000 are 8 respondents (2.67 per cent) respectively. The overall observation is in three mandals, the highest income level is in the category of 4001-6000 are 108 respondents (36.00 per cent). By this we can understand that the miserable income earning conditions of the labours which they unable to meet their basic needs.

**Table 8:** Distribution of Migrant Respondents by Income (After Migration)

| Name of the Mandal | Up to 4000 | 4001-8000 | 8001-12000 | 12001-16000 | 16001 & above | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jadcharla | 01 (0.33) | 06 (2.00) | 22 (7.33) | 36 (12.00) | 35 (11.67) | 100 (33.33) |
| Makthal | 03 (1.00) | 09 (3.00) | 31 (10.34) | 28 (9.33) | 29 (9.67) | 100 (33.34) |
| Kalwakurthy | 02 (0.67) | 06 (2.00) | 39 (13.00) | 30 (10.00) | 23 (7.66) | 100 (33.33) |
| **Total** | **6 (2.00)** | **21 (7.00)** | **92 (30.67)** | **94 (31.33)** | **87 (29.00)** | **300 (100.00)** |

(**Source:** Field Study, figures in brackets indicating Percentages)

On the whole, the majority of respondents, 94 are there in the income category of Rs. 12001 to 16000 and their percentage is 31.33 per cent. From this we can understand that their income level is grown up at their work place after migration.

**Table 9:** Average Monthly Expenditure of Migrant Respondents (Before Migration)

| Name of the Mandal | Up to 1000 | 1001-2000 | 2001-3000 | 3001-4000 | 4001 - 5000 | 5001 & above | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jadcharla | 17 (5.67) | 16 (5.33) | 14 (4.67) | 12 (4.00) | 14 (4.67) | 27 (9.00) | 100 (33.34) |
| Makthal | 30 (10.00) | 24 (8.00) | 11 (3.66) | 10 (3.33) | 11 (3.67) | 14 (4.67) | 100 (33.33) |
| Kalwakurthy | 28 (9.33) | 23 (7.67) | 12 (4.00) | 11 (3.67) | 11 (3.66) | 15 (5.00) | 100 (33.33) |
| **Total** | **75 (25.00)** | **63 (21.00)** | **37 (12.33)** | **33 (11.00)** | **36 (12.00)** | **56 (18.67)** | **300 (100.00)** |

(**Source:** Field Study, figures in brackets indicating Percentages)

From the above data, we can understand that there are higher number of respondents in the category of Rs. Up to 1000 expenditure depend upon their earnings which are very less in all three mandals before migration.

**Table 10:** Average Monthly Expenditure of Migrant Respondents (After Migration)

| Name of the Mandal | Up to 2000 | 2001-4000 | 4001-6000 | 6001-8000 | 8001 & above | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Jadcharla** | 27 (9.00) | 24 (8.00) | 29 (9.67) | 16 (5.33) | 4 (1.33) | **100 (33.33)** |
| **Makthal** | 37 (12.33) | 25 (8.33) | 27 (9.00) | 9 (3.00) | 02 (0.67) | **100 (33.33)** |
| **Kalwakurthy** | 35 (11.67) | 26 (8.67) | 25 (8.33) | 11 (3.67) | 3 (1.00) | **100 (33.34)** |
| **Total** | **99 (33.00)** | **75 (25.00)** | **81 (27.00)** | **36 (12.00)** | **9 (3.00)** | **300 (100.00)** |

(**Source:** Field Study, figures in brackets indicating Percentages)

We can understand from the above data that there are higher numbers of respondents in Rs. Up to 2000 category of monthly expenditure after migration in three mandals.

## CONCLUSION

Most of the migrant labourers working in the town were males and were married. Majority of the migrant labourers belonged to the productive age group of 26-45 years. Majority of the migrants had been working in the respective units for a long time and were not newly recruited and also, most of the people from this aged group are more adventurous and had less social obligations and thus, could migrate easily from one place to the other. Majority of these labourers came from different parts in Mahabubnagar district suffer from lack of employment opportunities and poverty. On the other hand, large number of migrants coming to Mahabubnagar town indicates better employment opportunities, good industrial development and better welfare facilities in Mahabubnagar town which thus, attract the migrant labourers.

The economic status of these labours is not good and the living conditions of migrant labourers were not satisfactory because majority of them did not lead a comfortable life as they did not own any durables. The debt position of these labourers indicates poor economic status as majority of them were indebted. The migrants had poor knowledge and unavailability of better and cheaper source of loan as majority took loans from money-lenders. The reasons for the same were identified as easy availability and trust. Some of the indebtedness was due to ancestral loans. Migration proved to be helpful to the migrants as it helped in improvement of personal and family economic status.

Economic reasons were identified the main factors for migration of labourers in Mahabubnagar district as factors like poverty, attraction of getting higher wages as compared to the place of origin and indebtedness were ranked as first, second and third respectively. The least important factor was marital purpose. Relatives were the most common source for selecting nearest cities as the destination place for migration and majority travelled through bus or train. This coincides with the fact that majority migrated from different places to Mahabubnagar town and the distance can be conveniently and cheaply covered with a maximum expenditure being up-to Rs.300. Majority of the migrants complained of being troubled by railway police as they were harassed by them for financial purposes.

Among the local labourers working in the state all were males while among the migrants that were working in the industries, some were females. A larger number of migrant labourers were married as compared to the locals and also they had larger number of children than the local labourers

which explains their need to earn money to sustain their families. However, they need to earn more money and uplift of the economic status was observed more in the locals as compared to the migrants as most of the local labourers had their wives working in the city other than the industries. The need of the locals to have more than one earning individual is explainable by the fact that they have more social obligations are aware of good living and educational standards and thus required more money for the same.

## REFERENCE

1. Ailaiah K. (2005): "Lambadas-A Sociological Perspective". Maithrya Publications, Warangal, India, pp. 73.
2. Dalton George (1971): "Distrciptive Ethnology of Bengal", Oxford University Press, Calcutta, pp. 68.
3. De Haan A. (1999): 'Livelihoods and Poverty: Role of Migration - A Critical Review of the Migration Literature'. Journal of Development Studies, 362: 1-47.
4. Firth Raymond (1951): "The Elements of Social Organization", Philosophical Society, New York, pp. 85.
5. Haviland William A. (1978): "Cultural Anthropology ". Macmillan, New York, pp. 159.
6. Mazumder D.N. and Madan T.N. (1970): "An Introduction to Social Anthropology" Asia publishing House, Bombay, pp. 192-193.
7. Rokib A. (2009): "Effect of Some Selected Socio-demographic Variables on Male Migrants on Bangladesh". Current Research Journal of Economic Theory, 1(1): 10-14.
8. Vishwanath T. (1991):  ' Information Flow, Job Search, and Migration'. Journal of Development Economics, 36: 313-335.