

Migrant Workers in the Commercial Construction Sector a Case Study of NOIDA Uttar Pradesh

Rahul

(Research Scholar) Department of Economics, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar (A Central University) Lucknow (U.P.) India.

Abstract: The construction sector providing largest number the employment opportunities after agriculture. NOIDA city is known for its industrial and constructed city and commercial area follows the development of Residential, Industrial and Institutional properties. In the matter of employment, the construction sector also plays a significant role for skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers. Constructed commercial building has attracted a large number of workers to NOIDA from different states. Rural to urban migration exist in this sector, mostly urban construction rural migrant an over third of rural migrants work in construction sector. Those who were working on the NOIDA construction sites, they are in engaged in different types labour economic activities. And duration of migration of workers in the NOIDA city was based on short time of period, approximate 70 percent workers (male and female) based on years (less than 1, up to 1 and 2 to 3). The present study has been focused on the migrant construction workers those who were mainly working in commercial construction sector in NOIDA city.

Key words: Migration, construction, commercial building, employment, rural & urban and unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled workers.

Objectives: To study the migrant workers in the commercial construction sectors.

I. Introduction

The migration of the construction worker is having a strong effect on the construction sector on the whole. There are many reason of the migration but major reason of the migration in the construction sector there was no work available native place. Migration occurs at a variety of scales: International (between continent), Intercontinental (between countries on a given continent), and interregional (with in countries). One of the most significant migration patterns has been rural to urban migration- the movement of people from the countryside to cities in search of opportunities. Generally, migrations have identified two parameters in defining migration: first geographic units, thus, the potential origin and destinations locations; and seasonal the time period in which individual must move between their communities and new found destinations – place to origin destination. The characteristic feature of labour in India is its migratory character. Therefore, migration of labour assumes great significance in the Indian economy. Migration is thought to be consequence of unequal development where in people from the regions of less employment and income opportunities flock.

1.2 METHODOLOGY

Purposive and random sample method used for collection the data from different construction sites (Princley, Amarpali, Prateek Silicon, Ajanara, Supertec) and sectors (66, 71, 72, 76, 100). Data has been classified male (n= 235, 78.33%) and female (n= 65, 21.66%) workers.

1.3 SAMPLE SIZE:

In the study 300 construction workers have been covered from NOIDA different construction sites. Data were collected 60 samples from each sector and construction sites from purposive Sampling and random method.

1.4 SAMPLE PROFILE

Primary data collection for the present study was done from construction workers those who are working in NOIDA city. A total 60 construction workers (included male and female) selected from each sector 66, 71, 72, 76, 100 and construction sites. Purposive and random sample method used for collection the data.

II. Theoretical Frame Work

Study of internal migration is a key importance in social science and it emerges not only the movement of people between one place to another place inside the country but also influences on livelihoods and urban growth. Among different theories (Neoclassical economics macro and micro migration, dual labour market

theory, world system theory and network theory) for migration, push pull theory is the most frequently heard enlightenment. Some people are pushed out to move from their locality while others have been pulled or magnetized to some others places else. This idea was first launched by Revenstein in 1989 who suggested that among push & pull factors may be the higher wages, high living standards, decreasing political violence and demand for specific skills set and knowledge (Institute of Migration, 201:17).

Lee (1996), theory argues that migration is due to pull and push factors refers to better employment, higher wages, better life conditions, and good health and education opportunities at destinations. On the other hand, migration is impelled by push (distress) factors at such as lack of employment, low wage rates, agricultural failure, debt, drought and other natural calamities. In this way people voluntarily migrated because of the aspiration to get forward more than desire to get away from the unpleasant situation.

2.2 TYPES OF MIGRATION:

There are three types of migration in the construction sector: permanent, contract and cross border/seasonal migration and three flows of like Rural (virtually all: rural – rural), Urban (rural–urban and urban – urban) and international. Moreover, there are different kinds of migration such as:-internal, external, emigration, Immigration, population transfer migration. The seasonal & temporary migration exists in the construction industry: rural, rural to urban and urban to urban. On the other hand internal and external job mobility (inter firm / inter plant) is very high in the construction sector. Workers are going to from one firm to another firm and one plant to another plant for better satisfaction such as: - high wages, good accommodation and other facilities.

III. Analysis And Interpretation Of Data

Table: 1

Types of Occupation

Variable		No. Of Cases		Percentage		
Number of Workers	Total	M	F	Total (%)	M (%)	F (%)
1. Skilled	100	100	0	33.33	33.33	0
2. Semi-skilled	100	85	15	33.33	28.33	5
3. Unskilled	100	50	50	33.33	16.66	16.66
Total	300	235	65	99.99	78.32	21.66

Source: Field Survey March 2015

Using a purposive sample design, a total of 100 (33.3%) workers each were selected from amongst Skilled, Semi-skilled and Unskilled workers.

Selected male workers were skilled 100 (33.33%), semi-skilled 85(28.33%) and unskilled workers 50 (16.66%) and female skilled workers 0 (0%), Semi-skilled workers 15 (5%) and Unskilled 50 (16.66%).

Table: 2

Gender Distribution

Variable	No. Of Cases	Percentage
1. Male	235	78.33
2. Female	65	21.66
Total	300	99.99

Source: Field Survey March 2015

Majority of Male workers were (n=235; 78.31%) and female workers were (n=65; 21.66%). And male to female ratio was 78.3:21:7.

Table: 3

Basis of Employment

Variable		No. Of Cases		Percentage	
Basis of Employment	Nos.	%	Total	%	
1. Casual	0	0	0	0	
2. Regular	0	0	0	0	
3. Self-employed	15	5	15	5	
4. Contractual	285	95	285	95	
Total	300	99.99	300	100.00	

Source: Field Survey March 2015

Total maximum majority of contractual workers were (n=285, 95%). And minimum majority of self – employed workers were (n=15, 5%). There were no workers casual and regular in commercial construction sector. And those who were self – employed workers in construction industry, they were engaged in three skilled works Glazier (n=5, 1.66%), Electrician (n=5, 1.66%) and Pipefitter (n=5, 1.66%).

Table: 4

Distribution of Migrants and Non- Migrants in NOIDA

Types of workers	Rural Migration		Urban Migration		Non Migration (Local)		Total	
	Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%
No. of workers	273	91	27	9	0	0	300	100
Male	208	69.33	27	9	0	0	235	78.33
Female	65	21.66	0	0	0	0	65	21.66
Total	273	99.99	27	9	0	0	300	99.99

Source: Field Survey March 2015

Analysis of this table that majority of the rural migrate workers were high n=273, 99.99%, (male; n=208, 69.33%, female; n=65, 21.66%) compare to urban migrate workers n=27, 9%, (male; n= 27, 9%, female; n=0) in NOIDA. It is showing that rural workers migration were very fast toward NOIDA city and those who were belong to different village and districts of the states. On the other hand, it was surprise that there were no local workers working on the construction site in NOIDA city.

Table: 5

Unit of the Migration and forms of Migration in the NOIDA

Modes of Migration	Rural migration (Workers)		Urban Migration (Workers)		Total (Workers)	
	Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%
Individual	7	2.33	27	9	34	11.33
Family	246	82	0	0	246	82
Group	20	6.66	0	0	20	6.66
Total	273	90.99	27	9	300	99.99

Source: Field Survey March 2015

Analysis of this table that modes of migration among rural workers were individual (n=7, 2.33%), family (n=246, 82%) and group (n=20, 6.66%) and urban workers individual (n=27, 9%), family (n=0) and group (n=0). After comparison unit migration among rural and urban migration that majority of the rural migrate workers were high in different modes of migration (individual, family and group) than urban unit of migration on the construction sites. Urban workers were engaged only individual modes of migration and there were no availability of family and group migration of the urban workers on the construction sites.

Table: 6

Distribution partial and full Migration workers in the NOIDA

Type of Migration	Full Migration		Partial Migration		Total workers	
	Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%
Rural Migration	0	0	273	91	273	91
Urban Migration	0	0	27	9	27	9
Total	0	0	300	100	300	100

Source: Field Survey March 2015

Analysis of this table that majority of the partial migration were from rural n=273, 91% and urban n=27, 9% on the construction sites. There were no full migration of the workers and they were partial migrated from both areas rural and urban in NOIDA.

Table:7

Distribution of migrant by sex and state of origin

Workers by sex

State / Place of Origin	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
West Bengal	103	34.33	48	16	151	50.33
Bihar	51	17	6	2	57	19
Uttar Pradesh	54	18	9	3	63	21
Madhya Pradesh	20	6.66	2	0.66	22	7.33
Jharkhand	4	1.33	-	-	4	1.33
Haryana	1	0.33	-	-	1	0.33
Assam	1	0.33	-	-	1	0.33
Nepal	1	0.33	-	-	1	0.33
Total Migrant	235	78.31	65	21.66	300	99.98

Source: Field Survey March 2015

Analysis of this table that majority of migrant workers were high from West Bengal n=151, 50.3% (male; n=103, 34.3%, female n= 48, 16%) and U.P. n=63, 21%. Moreover, minimum majority of migrant workers were from Jharkhand, Haryana, Assam and Nepal (n=4, 1.33%, n=1, 0.33%, n=1, 0.33%, n=1, 0.33%).

On other hand majority of male and female workers were high from West Bengal (n=103, 34.3%, n=48, 16%), and U.P (n=54, 18%, n=9, 3%), Bihar (n=51, 17.0%, n=6, 1%) and M.P. (n=20, 6.66%, n=2, 0.66%). And there

were no one female migrant workers from these states: Jharkhand, Haryana, Assam and Nepal on the construction sites in NOIDA city.

Table: 8
Distribution of migrant by sex and economic activities
Workers across sex

Economic activities	Male		Female		Total	
	Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%
Participating in family farming	79	26.33	27	9	106	35.33
Participation in family business	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farm labour	67	22.33	7	2.33	74	24.66
Manufacturing workers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Worker	56	18.66	0	0	69	23
Participation in work community services	0	0	13	4.33	0	0
House wife	0	0	0	0	18	6
Unemployed	33	11	18	6	51	17
Total	235	78.32	65	21.6	300	99.99

Source: Field Survey March 2015

Analysis of this table that maximum majority of workers were engaged in family farming activities n=106, 35.33%, (Male; n= 79, 26.33%, Female; n= 27, 9%), and farm labour activities were n=74, 24.66%, (Male n= 67, 22.33%, Female n=7, 2.33%). And another high majority of workers were engaged in construction activities n= 56, 18.66 % (Male; n= 56, 18.66%, Female; n= 0).

On the other hand minimum majority of workers were engaged in work community services n=13, 4.33%, (Male; n=0, Female; n= 13, 4.33%). There was no participation of workers in these economic activities such as: Family business and manufacturing work and unemployed workers were n=51, 17%, (Male; n=33, 11%, Female; n=18, 6%).

Table: 9
Distribution of Migrant workers by sex and duration of migration

Duration group (years)	Male		Female		Total	
	Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%
Less than 1	63	21	11	3.66	74	24.66
Up to 1	31	10.33	16	5.33	47	15.66
2 to 3	32	10.66	21	7	53	17.66
3 to 4	34	11.33	11	3.66	45	15
4 to 5	9	3	4	1.33	13	4.33
5 to 6	33	11	-	-	33	11
6 to 7	4	1.33	-	-	4	1.33
7 to 8	9	3	-	-	9	3
8 to 9	6	2	-	-	6	2
9 to 10			2	0.66	2	0.66
10 to 11	4	1.33	-	-	4	1.33
11 to 12	2	0.66	-	-	2	0.66
12 to 13	5	1.66	-	-	5	1.66
13 to 14	0	0	-	-	0	0
14 to 15	0	0	-	-	0	0
15 to 16	2	0.66	-	-	2	0.66
16 to 17			-	-		0
17 to 18	1	0.33	-	-	1	0.33
Total	235	78.29	65	21.64	300	99.94

Source: Field Survey March 2015

The analysis of the time-frame of the migration shows that high majority of workers were (n=74, 24.66%) duration of time less than 1 year, (n=47, 15.66%) duration of time Up to 1 year, (n=53, 17.66%) duration of time 2 to 3 years, (n=45, 15%) duration of time 3 to 4 years, (n=33, 11%) duration of time 6 to 7 years.

And minimum majority of the workers were (n=13, 4.33%) duration of time 5 to 6 years, (n=9, 3%) duration the 7 to 8 years, (n=6, 2%) duration of time 8 to 9 years, (n=5, 1.66%) duration of time 12 to 13 years, (n=4, 1.33%) duration of time 6 to 7 & 10 to 11 years, (n=2, 0.66%) duration of time 9 to 10, 11 to 12 & 15 to 16 years and (n=1, 0.3%) duration of time 17 to 18 years.

Duration of migration time depends on short period on the construction sites in the NOIDA city. It was showing that there was not permanent stability of workers and they were only partially migrated in construction sector. On the other hand, after comparison among migrated male and female workers has been found that duration of time among migrated female workers very less than male workers in the NOIDA city.

And high majority of male migrate workers were (n=63, 21%) duration of time less than 1 year, (n=34, 10.66%) duration of time 3 to 4 years, (n=33, 11%) duration of time 5 to 6 years, (n=32, 10.66%) duration of time 2 to 3

years and (n=31, 10.33%) duration of time up to 1 years. On the other hand high majority of female migrate workers were (n=21, 7%), duration of time 2 to 3 years, (n=16, 10.33%) duration of time up to 1 years, (n=11, 3.66%) duration of time less than 1 year & duration of 3 to 5 years.

Minimum majority of male migrate workers were (n=9, 3%) duration of time 4 to 5 years & 7 to 10 years, (n=5, 1.66%) duration of time 12 to 13 years (n=4, 1.33%) duration of time 6 to 7 years & 10 to 11 years, (n=2, 0.66%) duration of time 15 to 16 years & (n=1, 0.33%) duration of time 17 to 18 years. On the other hand minimum majority of female migrate workers were (n=4, 1.33%) duration of time 4 to 5 years and (n=2, 0.66%) duration of time 9 to 10 years.

Table: 10
Distribution of Migrant workers by sex and reasons for migration
Workers by Sex

Reasons of Migration	Male		Female		Total	
	Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%
No work available native place	135	45	36	12	171	57
Inadequate income	34	11.3	7	2.33	41	13.6
Heavy Indebtness	15	5	6	2	21	7
Domestic dispute	1	0.33	-	-	1	0.33
Social discrimination		-		-		
Any other (i.e. better prospects of job opportunities)	50	16.66	16	5.33	66	22
Total	235	78.29	65	21.66	300	99.93

Source: Field Survey March 2015

Analysis of this table that highest reason of migration among workers was that no work available native place; n= 171, 57% (male; n=135, 45%, female; n=36, 12%). On the other reason of migration were that inadequate income native place; n=41, 13.6% (male; n= 34, 11.3%, female; n=7, 2.33%), heavy indebttness; n=21, 7% (male; n=15, 5%, female; n=6, 2%), domestic dispute n=1, 0.33% (male; n=1, 0.33%, female; n=0) and any other (i.e. better prospects of job opportunities) n=66, 22% (male; n=50, 16.66%, female n=16, 5.33%).

MAIN FINDINGS

The main findings from this study are summarised in the followings points:-

- Majority of workers were very high from West-Bengal to different districts like Cooch-Bihar, Vardhmaan, Maalda and others. But they were partially migrated in the NOIDA city.
- Almost those who are workers (unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled) working on the construction sites. They were from rural areas and with family migrated in NOIDA city.
- It was surprise that there was no local worker on the construction sites. They were also from different parts of India.
- There were three category of migrated workers (unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled workers) and different types of sub categories of workers (unskilled; weight-lifter, dust-lifter and semi-skilled workers; concrete-mixer, Bricklayer, and skilled workers; mason, tiles-fitter etc.).
- Construction workers were engaged in different type labour intensive work. But highest majority of the workers were engaged participating in farming labour.
- Workers were having newly entered in NOIDA. They were living in NOIDA from two and three months and duration of time migration workers based on short period. Maximum limit of the migration was 8 to 12 months on the construction sites in NOIDA city.
- There were many reason of the migration for come to NOIDA. But very closely reason of the migration was that no work available at native place.
- The construction worker emanates from all parts but even there are specified areas: Centring, steel bender and cement finisher come from Eastern Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh and Masonry workers from Bihar and tiles fitter and electrician from Haryana. On the other hand, it was amazing fact that almost unskilled workers were from West Bengal.

References

- [1]. **Dileep Kumatr (April 2013)**, "Inimitable issues of construction workers": Case study.
- [2]. **T. Subramani, V. Jayaraman (May 2015)**, "Analysis of construction workers migrate from industries".
- [3]. **Akbar Hossen, Arif Uddin Khan, Zakia Sharmin, Tania Jannatual Kubra (2015)**, "Internal Migration and condition of female construction workers: A study in Chittagong city": International letters of school and humanistic science. vol. 46. p.p.1-13
- [4]. **Ashok Basirat Akinola, Anil Kumar, Indira Krishna, Satish Chetlapalli (2013)**, "Vulnerability profile of migrant construction workers to HIV/AIDS in an urban area in South India": - a cross sectional study. Vol. 17, Issue 4, pp. 75-77
- [5]. **Benjamin Zeitlyn and Priya Deshingkar, Bridget Holtom (May 2014)**, "Internal and Regional migration for construction work": A Research Agenda. Working paper 14
- [6]. **Jagannath Adhikari & Priya Deshingkar (April 2015)**, "How migration into urban construction work impacts on rural household in Nepal."

- [7]. **Tushar Agarwal & S. Chandrasekhar (April 2015)**, “Shorts term migrants in India: Characteristics, Wages, and Work transition.” Indira Ghandi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai.
- [8]. **Arun N. Solanki & Kirti S. Zankharia (January 2015)**, “Migrant construction workers in the unorganised sector of Surat City-A Socio-Economic Analysis.” Vol. – 3, Issue- 1.
- [9]. **Harsh Mander & Gayatri Sahagal (2010)**, “Internal migration in India: Distress and Opportunities.”
- [10]. **Priya Deshingkar and Deniel Start (August 2003)**, “Seasonal migration for livelihood in India: Coping, Accumulation and Exclusion.”
- [11]. **Sharmik Sahayata Evam Sandarbha Kendra (September 2007)**, “Migrant construction workers in Ahmadabad.”
- [12]. **Ritesh Dwivedi (December 2012)**, “Migration: An overview and relevant issue.”
- [13]. **Wajia Hamid (April 2007)**, “Seen but Unheard: - A case study of low – waged TamilNadu migrant workers in Singapore.”
- [14]. **Chitraporn Vanapong (2012)**, “A case study of Thai migrant workers exploited in Sweden.”
- [15]. **Bingqin Li and Huamin Peng (November 2006)**, “The social protection of rural workers in the construction industry in urban China.”
- [16]. **Madhu Nagla(2011)**, “Migrant labour and Leisure: An analysis.”
- [17]. **Rasmus Ahlstrand (December 2014)**, “Human security under construction: Exploring social consequences for labour migrants in and enlarged European Union.”
- [18]. **PriyaDeshingkar, Rajiv Khandewal and John Farrington (September 2008)**, “Support for migrant workers.” The missing link in India’s development.