

An Examination on the Perceptions over the treatment towards the Migrant Labor of select sectors after the Pandemic in the state of Andhra Pradesh

¹ Shaik Mohammad Rafi, ² Dr. Nagaraju Battu,

¹ Research Scholar, ² Associate Professor,
University College of Arts, Commerce & Law,
Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India.

Abstract

The migrant labor perception towards the select sectors after the COVID – 19 is presented in this research paper. In order to prove this the researcher collected 758 samples from the different sectors such as construction, hospitality, agriculture and un-organized manufacturing sectors. The researcher applied cross-tabulation analysis to know the migrant labor perceptions towards the various sectors in the state of Andhra Pradesh.

Key Words

Migrant labor perceptions, Pandemic, Andhra Pradesh, Treatment of Migrant labor

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has brought about unimaginable hardships for migrant workers largely employed in India's informal sectors. Last year, when a sudden national lockdown was declared to curb the spread of COVID-19, these migrant workers were stuck without any socio-economic and health security in the cities where they worked, unable to return to their native places. Images of economic migrants desperately trying to return home by walking on foot amidst a series of challenges like lack of transportation, potential starvation and destitution, fear of COVID-19, social prejudice, and administrative antagonism, brought their vulnerability to the fore front. Subsequently, certain relief measures ensuring free availability of food, temporary shelter, and transport arrangements, though delayed, were provided by the Centre as well as state governments. However, as several studies have suggested, the welfare

schemes, though well-intentioned, have had massive glitches and inadequacies in their implementation, keeping a major section of needy migrants deprived of such relief measures.

Review of Literature

Ankrah Kwaku Twumasi (1995) *Rural Urban Migration & Socioeconomic Development in Ghana*: This article discusses the case of Ghana, where rural urban migration creates major change in social and behavioural pattern of migrant people when these migrants decide to shift their base due to availability of better education, healthcare facilities and entertainment and then this force them to resocialize their behaviours which ultimately leads to change in behavioural pattern.

Afsar Rita (2003) *Internal Migration & development Nexus – The Case of Bangladesh*: The paper focuses on the core concept of rural – urban migration, which explains, that people move for better employment options as they are less dependent on agricultural sector. These migrants normally face job insecurity, poor working condition & discrimination in the urban work place. The paper also challenges the very basic fact that rural urban migration brings rural poverty to urban areas. The actual fact is that due to increase in remittances, savings rate as well as standard of living has improved remarkably. And this becomes possible due to movement of people from less developed rural areas to well-developed urban areas.

Kennan John, Walker R. James (2003) *The Effect of Expected Income on Individual Migration Decisions*: The paper tries to develop a model on the basis of a factor, i.e. the role of expected income that influences the migration decision. The analysis of the paper indicates that the link between expected income and decision of migration depends on the geographic differences of mean wage and technology to move in search of a better Location match when the income differences exist in present location.

Dubey Amaresh, Jones Palmer Richard, Sen Kunal (2004) *Surplus Labour, Social Structure & Rural to Urban Migration – Evidence from Indian Data*: This paper mainly focuses on surplus labour, social structure and rural to urban migration. The empirical

analysis on India's rural urban migration suggests that the key prediction of Lewis Model is that the rural urban migration is influenced by the existence of surplus labour. States with high labour – land ratios and low agricultural productivity are likely to see more out the migration. The other major findings of the paper is that unlike Lewis model the rural urban migration phenomenon is complex in nature and basically depends on socioeconomic conditions as well as possessions of skills. This suggests that an individual, whose level of education is low, is less likely to move to urban areas. This also indicates that they failed to acquire higher education because they are poor. The major policy implication is that the policy makers should not conclude that because of rural urban migration, rural poverty decreases in the surplus labour regions as poor people are less likely to move.

Deshingkar Priya (2004) *Understanding the Implications of Migration for Pro Poor Agricultural Growth*: The paper highlights on the fact that increasing mobility of rural urban migration is happening because of nature of migration is temporary or seasonal. This type of migration helps the migrants to increase the flow of remittances mainly from on - farm activities in urban location, which is easily available. This creates a demand for income generating opportunity in non - farm activities rather than agricultural income, although these temporary migrants are living in rural areas.

Black Richard, Hiker McLean Lindsay, Poole Claire (2004) *Migration & Pro Poor Policy in East Africa*: The paper focuses on the nature of migration and its impact in East African countries. In general it is observed that rural families often place the family members in different location to reduce the risk of income loss. Apart from that, role of education is also one of the important determinants of rural urban migration in general.

Kuhn S. Randall (2005) *The Determinants of Family & Individual Migration – A Case Study of Rural Bangladesh*: The paper discusses the issue of rural urban migration considering the role of family as one of the important parameters. The individual migration decision is more likely among those who have less land holding, whereas in case of family migration, marriage of people and those who don't have any land holding are important determinants. These people tend to migrate along with their family

members. The important aspect is that, after marriage chances of individual migration decreases and family migration increases.

Hashim M Iman (2005) *Exploring the Linkages between Children's Independent Migration & Education – Evidence from Ghana*: The paper focuses on the issue of children's independent migration in Ghana. The study found that a large number of children in Ghana migrate in order to pursue their education or to arrange schools fees through their earnings from rural urban migration process, which give them sufficient income in urban counterpart.

Gardner Katy & Ahmed Zahir (2006) *Place, Social Protection & Migration in Bangladesh – A Londoni Village in Biswanath*: The paper highlights on the relationship between migration, poverty and social protection in an area of Bangladesh where the rate of migration towards London is very high. These migrants are able to create a socioeconomic impact during their short or long stay in their respective places. Their investment increases the livelihoods conditions and provides the poor people some kind of social protection. This not only help the poor in that region but it also attracts the people from other regions where this kind of economic development is absent due to lack of international migration. Thus, the paper suggests that this migration nature not only benefit the society at large, but it also provide the desired social protection, that the poor people are looking for.

Shanthi K. (2006) *Female Labour Migration in India*: The objective of the paper is to identify the pace of employment oriented migration. Traditionally, in case of women, it was observed that the marriage is the main reason for migration, but the recent trend also emphasise the rise of independent women migration on the background of increase unemployment opportunities in garment sector, export industries etc.

Research Gap:

The impact of COVID – 19 over the living standards of migrant labor is very much effective. There are no much research studies on the challenges and issues of migrant labor. Hence, this study considered how the migrant labors are treated in the organizations.

Research Methodology

The researcher collected the samples from different sectors such as construction, hospitality, agriculture and un-organized manufacturing. However, the researcher collected 758 samples from the concerned sectors. The researcher applied cross-tabulation analysis to analysed the data.

Demographic Profile of the Respondents:

The primary data is collected from the migrant labor who is working in the various sectors such as, construction, hospitality, agriculture and un-organized manufacturing sectors. However, the data is collected from four different cities like, Guntur, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupati. Totally 756 migrant labor workers' data is collected and analyzed. Respondent's demographic and socio-economic characteristics are presented in the following.

Respondent's Socio-economic, Demographic and Geographic characteristics:

The primary data depicted that, there are 530 males (70.11 percent) and 226 female (29.89 percent) respondents. There are 278 (36.77 percent) respondents in the age of 25-35 years of range, 308 (40.74 percent) members in the range of 35 – 45 years of age range, 124 (16.4 percent) of members in the range of 45-55 years and 46 (6.08 percent) had more than 55 years of age. Among the total migrant labor, 700 (92.59 percent) of the migrant labor are married and 56 (7.41 percent) of the respondents are unmarried.

The data has been collected from 174 (23.02 percent) respondents from construction sector, 169 (22.35 percent) respondents from hospitality sector, 263 (34.73 percent) respondents' data is collected from agriculture sector and 150 (19.84 percent) respondents collected from un-organized manufacturing sector.

The data has been collected from 15 (1.98 percent) urban area migrant labor, 549 (72.62 percent) are from rural area migrant labor and 192 (25.4 percent) are from the Semi-urban area migrant labor. 466 (61.64 percent) of the migrant labor had Below Primary Education qualification, 252 (33.33 percent) migrant labor had primary education as their highest qualification and merely 38 (5.03 percent) of the migrant labor had Intermediate

qualification. The major chunk of the respondents i.e. 346 (45.77 percent) has below Rs 10,000 of monthly income, 244 (32.28 percent) has Rs 10,000 to 15,000 of monthly income, 120 (15.87 percent) members had Rs 15,000 to 20,000 of monthly income and 46 (6.08 percent) had more than Rs 20,000 of monthly income. Majority of the respondents 346 (45.77 percent) has 2 to 5 years of experience, 278 (36.77 percent) had 0 to 2 years of experience. 62 (8.2 percent) had 5 to 10 years of experience and 70 (9.26 percent) of the migrant labor have more than 10 years of experience. The hospital migrant labor demographic details are summarized in Table - 1

Cross – Tabulation Analysis:

The researcher conducted the cross-tabulation analysis to find the association between the demographic factors and the migrant labors' perceptions towards the factors affecting the migrant labor towards the living standards of migrant lab

Table – 1: Cross-Tabulation Analysis between Demographics and Rating on treatment towards migrant labor

Demographic Description		Total sample n=756	Very much likely	Likely	Neutral	Unlikely	Very much unlikely	Chi Sq
Gender	Male	530(70.11)	0(0)	10(1.89)	48(9.06)	365(68.87)	107(20.19)	7.497,df4,>0.05
	Female	226(29.89)	2(0.88)	8(3.54)	22(9.73)	144(63.72)	50(22.12)	
Age	25-35 Years	278(36.77)	0(0)	4(1.44)	29(10.43)	195(70.14)	50(17.99)	22.011,df12,<0.05
	35-45 Years	308(40.74)	0(0)	12(3.9)	30(9.74)	201(65.26)	65(21.1)	
	45-55 Years	124(16.4)	2(1.61)	2(1.61)	7(5.65)	85(68.55)	28(22.58)	
	Above 55 years	46(6.08)	0(0)	0(0)	4(8.7)	28(60.87)	14(30.43)	
Marital Status	Married	700(92.59)	1(0.14)	16(2.29)	64(9.14)	472(67.43)	147(21)	6.049,df4,>0.05
	Unmarried	56(7.41)	1(1.79)	2(3.57)	6(10.71)	37(66.07)	10(17.86)	
Sector	Construction sector	174(23.02)	1(0.57)	6(3.45)	12(6.9)	113(64.94)	42(24.14)	20.675,df12,>0.05
	Hospitality sector	169(22.35)	0(0)	3(1.78)	17(10.06)	119(70.41)	30(17.75)	
	Agriculture sector	263(34.79)	1(0.38)	9(3.42)	17(6.46)	181(68.82)	55(20.91)	
	Un-organized manufacturing sector	150(19.84)	0(0)	0(0)	24(16)	96(64)	30(20)	
Area of living	Urban area	15(1.98)	0(0)	0(0)	3(20)	9(60)	3(20)	5.360,df8,>0.05
	Rural area	549(72.62)	2(0.36)	11(2)	52(9.47)	372(67.76)	112(20.4)	
	Semi-urban area	192(25.4)	0(0)	7(3.65)	15(7.81)	128(66.67)	42(21.88)	
Qualification	Below Primary Education	466(61.64)	0(0)	10(2.15)	44(9.44)	327(70.17)	85(18.24)	15.321,df8,>0.05
	Primary education	252(33.33)	2(0.79)	8(3.17)	19(7.54)	160(63.49)	63(25)	
	Intermediate	38(5.03)	0(0)	0(0)	7(18.42)	22(57.89)	9(23.68)	
Monthly Salary	>Rs10,000	346(45.77)	0(0)	2(0.58)	29(8.38)	244(70.52)	71(20.52)	25.425,df12,<0.05
	Rs10,000 - Rs15,000	244(32.28)	0(0)	10(4.1)	27(11.07)	157(64.34)	50(20.49)	
	Rs15,000 - Rs20,000	120(15.87)	2(1.67)	6(5)	10(8.33)	76(63.33)	26(21.67)	
	>Rs 20,000	46(6.08)	0(0)	0(0)	4(8.7)	32(69.57)	10(21.74)	
Experience	0-2 Years	278(36.77)	0(0)	4(1.44)	26(9.35)	202(72.66)	46(16.55)	15.932,df12,>0.05
	2-5 Years	346(45.77)	2(0.58)	12(3.47)	34(9.83)	219(63.29)	79(22.83)	
	5-10 Years	62(8.2)	0(0)	2(3.23)	2(3.23)	42(67.74)	16(25.81)	
	> 10 Years	70(9.26)	0(0)	0(0)	8(11.43)	46(65.71)	16(22.86)	

Source: Primary Dat

Findings

The cross-tabulation results for the migrant workers perception on rating on treatment towards migrant labor in the organization with gender of respondents revealed that (7.497, df4, >0.05) there is no significant association between them. The cross-tabulation results for the migrant workers perception on rating on treatment towards migrant labor in the organization with age of the respondents revealed that (22.011, df2, <0.05) there is a significant association between them. The cross-tabulation results for migrant workers perception on rating on treatment towards migrant labor in the organization with marital status of migrant labor revealed that (6.049, df4, >0.05) there is no significant association between them.

The cross-tabulation results for migrant workers perception on rating on treatment towards migrant labor in the organization with working organization of the respondents revealed that (20.675, df12, >0.05) there is no significant association between them. The cross-tabulation results for migrant workers perception on rating on treatment towards migrant labor in the organization with area of living has revealed that (5.360, df8, >0.05) there is no significant association between them. The cross-tabulation results for migrant workers perception on rating on treatment towards migrant labor in the organization with the qualification of the employee has revealed that (15.321, df8, >0.05) there is no significant association between them. The cross-tabulation results for migrant workers perception on rating on treatment towards migrant labor in the organization with the monthly salary revealed that (25.425, df12, <0.05) there is a significant association between them. The cross-tabulation results for migrant workers perception on rating on treatment towards migrant labor in the organization with the years of work experience with the organization revealed that (15.932, df12, >0.05) there is no significant association between them.

Conclusion

The results of the findings disclosed that the treatment towards the migrant labor in after the pandemic is found to be not satisfactory. Hence, it is suggested to improve the measures to treat the migrant labor properly in the various sectors.

Reference

- 1) Report by ILO United Nations Published in business Standard Thu, July 01 2021. 11:26 IST
- 2) Kwaku Twumasi Ankrah (1995), Rural Urban Migration & Socioeconomic Development in Ghana; Journal of Social Development in Africa, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 13 – 22
- 3) Rita Afsar (1999), Rural-urban dichotomy and convergence: emerging realities in Bangladesh
- 4) John Kennan & James R. Walker (March 2003), The Effect of Expected Income on Individual Migration Decisions; Working Paper 9585, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- 5) Amaresh Dubey, Richard Palmer – Jones & Kunal Sen (July 2004), Surplus Labour, Social Structure & Rural to Urban Migration: Evidence from Indian Data; Conference Paper Presented at the Conference on the 50th Anniversary of the Lewis Model
- 6) Priya Deshingkar (June 2004), Understanding the Implications of Migration for Pro – poor Agricultural Growth; Overseas Development Institute, London, Paper prepared for the DAC POVNET Agriculture Task Group Meeting
- 7) Richard Black, Lyndsay Mclean Hilker & Claire Pooley (November 2004), Migration and Pro – poor Policy in East Africa; Working Paper C 7, Sussex Centre for Migration Research
- 8) Randall S. Kuhn (July 2005), The Determinants of Family & Individual Migration: A Case Study of Rural Bangladesh; Working Paper, Research Programme on Population Processes, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado
- 9) Iman M Hashim (August 2005), Exploring the Linkages Between Children’s Independent Migration & Education: Evidence from Ghana; Sussex Centre for Migration Research
- 10) Katy Gardner & Zahir Ahmed (November 2006), Place Social Protection & Migration in Bangladesh: A Londoni Village in Biswanath; Sussex Centre for Migration Research