

## Entitlements to Basics Services of Inter-State Migrants Living in Urban Slums of Bangalore City

Suchismita Mishra, T Rajendra Prasad

<sup>1</sup>Post doctoral research fellow at Bangalore University,

<sup>2</sup>Bangalore University, Bangalore

suchismita44@gmail.com, trprasadbub@gmail.com

### Introduction

In urban areas, there is the availability of better employment, education, and health infrastructure, and hence, people forced to migrate from rural to urban area. Along with this, due to change in the occupational pattern and development of transport and communication, the interstate migration is found in an increasing trend. In some regions of India, three out of four households include a migrant. Despite this fact, internal migration has been accorded very low priority by the government, and existing policies in India have failed in providing social protection to this vulnerable group. This can be attributed in part to a serious data gap on the extent, nature, and magnitude of internal migration (UNESCO, 2013). Bangalore, officially called now as Bengaluru, is the capital of Indian state of Karnataka. It is the third most populous city in India. As per 2001 census of India, it was found that about 30.62 percent of the total population of the state is considered as migrants, and from 1971 to 2001, it is observed that the percentage of interstate migration found in an increasing trend i.e., 12.64 % in 1971, 13.95 % in 1981, 12.44 % in 1991 and 13.02 % in 2001. More than 85 percent of in-migrants are from the neighboring state, namely, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, and Kerala. All these points emphasize the importance of studying interstate migration in Karnataka in general and Bengaluru in particular. The migrant population tries to settle themselves in urban slums because of their poor financial condition. However, the recent migrants mostly settle themselves in unauthorized slums or migrant tents, which have no basic amenities. Along with this background, their migrant status put them into more vulnerability. UNESCO emphasized that there is a pressing need to ensure that urban settlements become inclusive spaces as they expand in size and diversity. This would require adequate and affordable housing, health and education services as well as infrastructure and sanitation. Improving migrants' access to government services and welfare programmes can improve the quality of life of migrants. This will, in turn, lay the foundations for a more inclusive and integrated society and balance economic prosperity and social diversity (UNESCO, 2013). Even though the inter-state migrants contribute to the urban resources significantly, their contribution is not visible to the urban authorities, or they are ignoring, and this can be visible in their less accessibility which results in the lack of basic facilities. In this context, we report the status of these internal migrants in terms of entitlement to basic services in Bangalore city.

### Methodology

This community-based study has been undertaken in South Bangalore. A pilot study was carried out in various slums/migrant settlements. Notified and Non-notified slums were identified through the data of municipality and other development authorities. Attempts were made to identify clusters particularly from newer slums, de-notified slums, and camps, where newcomer usually resides. Snow-balling technique was also used during the pilot survey for identifying this type of habitations. Only the slum locations which are having more than 100 households were considered as a cluster for inclusion as a unit of population. Inter-state migrants living in newer slums/non-notified slums were given more weight while selecting clusters. From them, 5 locations/clusters were identified on the basis of availability of migrants living for not less than 6 months and not more than 7 years. The study slum population belongs to two types of slum, and they are non-notified slum (50%) and migrant camps (50%). The identified slums/migrant camps are: 1) Anjanapura

2) Kothannur village, 3) Odrupalya, 4) Opposite to Vinayaka Theatre, Konanakunte and 5) Krishna Appa Layout (near to Nice Road).

Households of eligible migrants were identified from various clusters in the city. Hundred mothers with a child aged below 2 years were interviewed with a pretested questionnaire. Data were collected using a pre-tested questionnaire. Socio-economic variables including the basic facilities and housing structure, were collected from the respondents. Data obtained in quantitative surveys were entered into the computer through MS Excel, and analyses were done using SPSS for Windows v.22.0.

## Result

The socio-economic data revealed that the respondents belonged from the age of 16 years to 40 years. More than half of respondents (54%) are found in the age group between 19-25 years, followed by 23% of respondents in the age group of 26-32 years 18% are found below 18 years of age. Out of the 100 respondents, more than half of the populations (55%) are illiterate. Majority of the respondents (44%) belonged to other backward castes (OBC) category, followed by 23% to scheduled castes (SC) and 22% to scheduled tribes (ST). It is evident from Table 1 that a considerable number of respondents (40%) migrated to the city from neighboring states like Andhra Pradesh and Bihar (23%), Rajasthan (10%), Assam (10%), Uttar Pradesh (8%), etc. From states like Andhra Pradesh, Assam, and Bihar, the recent migrants (0.6 to 3 years) are more living as compare to the settled migrant's category (4 to 7 years). In contrast to this, from states like Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, and Uttar Pradesh, the settled migrants are more compared to recent migrants.

**Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by the Place of Migration and Duration of Migration**

Place from	Years of Migration		Total
	06 – 3 Years	4 – 7 Years	
Andhra Pradesh	25	15	40
Assam	10	0	10
Bihar	15	8	23
Rajasthan	4	8	12
Tamil Nadu	3	4	7
Uttar Pradesh	3	5	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

With regard to the reason for migration, the majority of the respondents (56%) migrated to the city in search of getting better earnings. Some (28%) cited the marriage as a reason, whereas some respondents (15%) cited natural calamities as a reason for migration to the current habitat (Table 2).

**Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by the Reason for Migration**

Reason for Migration	Frequency	Percentage
Better earnings	56	56.0
Natural calamities	15	15.0
Marriage	28	28.0
Others	01	01.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 3: Distribution of Respondents by the Type of House**

Type of House	Frequency	Percent
Hut	47	47.0
Katcha	7	7.0
Pacca	24	24.0
Semi Pacca	15	15.0
Open space	7	7.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 3 shows the detail of the type of house of the respondents. Majority (47%) of the respondents have huts, followed by 24% have pucca houses. Some have semi pucca houses (15%), and few have katcha (7%). A small number of respondents (7%) reported that they live in open space. Distribution of respondents by ownership of the house is shown in Table 4. Majority of respondents (55%) have rented houses. Also, a considerable number of respondents (35%) were staying free, and few (10%) have their own houses. Those who are staying free mostly provided by the contractors for whom the respondents are working or on government's vacant land.

**Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by Ownership of House**

Ownership of House	Frequency	Percent
Own	10	10.0
Rental	55	55.0
Free	35	35.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 5 presents the distribution of respondents in terms of a number of rooms in their house. All most all the respondents had houses with only one room (93%), and the rest of the respondents (7%) had two rooms.

**Table 5: Distribution of Respondents by Number of Rooms**

Number of Rooms	Frequency	Percent
1 Room	93	93.0
2 Room	7	07.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Majority of the houses (75%) have no separate kitchen, and rest houses (25%) have a separate kitchen (Table 6). The respondents were asked about the place of cooking if there is no separate kitchen. Majority of the respondents (56%) replied that they cook in the living room, and some respondents (19%) cook in the open space available outside their house (Table 7).

**Table 6: Distribution of Respondents by Having Separate Kitchen**

Having Separate Kitchen	Frequency	Percent
Yes	25	25.0
No	75	75.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 7: Distribution of Respondents by Place of Cooking (If Separate Kitchen is not there)**

Place of Cooking	Frequency	Percent
0	25	25.0
Living room	56	56.0
Open space	19	19.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

With regard to the distribution of respondents by getting the source of water, the majority of the respondents said tanker lorry (76%) is the source of drinking water (Table 8). Few (9%) replied that public tap as a source of drinking water, and 7% of respondents replied hand pump as the source of water supply.

**Table 8: Distribution of Respondents by Getting Source of Water**

Source of getting Water	Frequency	Percent
Hand pump	07	7.0
Public tap	09	9.0
Tanker_truck	76	76.0

Public tap & Tanker	08	8.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

It is noted from the Table 9 that a considerable number of households (55%) use open space/drainage as a toilet. Surprisingly, only a few (9%) of respondents have own toilet. Some respondents (36%) have shared a toilet. Open defecation is still in practice for majority of these urban migrants (55%) due to lack of toilet facility.

**Table 9: Distribution of Respondents by Having Toilet facility**

Having Toilet Facility	Frequency	Percentage
Separate own toilet	09	9.0
Shared toilet	36	36.0
Open space/drainage	55	55.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Regarding having drainage facility, majority of the respondents (66%) replied that they do not have drainage facility, and the rest of them (34%) said they have open drainage. Having closed drain facility is reported by none of the respondents (Table 10).

**Table 10: Distribution of Respondents by Having Drainage Facility**

Drainage Facility	Frequency	Percent
Open drainage	34	34.0
No drainage	66	66.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

With regard to the connection of electricity, a considerable number of households (48%) have no electricity connection; whereas 30% of respondents have metered connection followed by 22% of respondents have drawn electricity illegally from the street lines (Table 11). However, it is observed that many households were dependent on solar lights, especially who do not have electricity connection.

**Table 11: Distribution of Respondents by Having Electricity Facility**

Having Electricity Bill	Frequency	Percent
Metered connection	30	30.0
Drawn from the street lines	22	22.0
No connection	48	48.0

<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>
--------------	------------	--------------

Table 12 reveals the possession of ration cards among these migrants. A considerable number of respondents (57%) said that they do not possess a ration card. Ration card provides them some subsidies while purchasing food provisions from the government fair price shops and also it is very much beneficial in getting health and other services from government. It is used as a identity proof. This card is also referred to as below poverty line (BPL) card. With regard to the distribution of respondents in terms of place of getting the ration card, only (4%) got the ration card in Bangalore city and the rest (39%) got from their native place (Table 13).

**Table 12: Distribution of Respondents by Having Ration Card**

<b>Having Ration Card</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	43	43.0
No	57	57.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 13: Distribution of Respondents by Place They Got the Ration Card**

<b>The place they got the ration card</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No card	57	57.0
Bangalore	04	04.0
Native place	39	39.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

During data collection, it was found that the general problems of the migrant population are – water shortage, lack of roads, unhygienic surroundings, dust, mosquitoes, lack of toilets, lack of school for their children and language problem. The common health problems of these areas are dengue, fever, diarrhoea, respiratory infections, etc. Regarding negligence in getting the basic services because of their migrant status, many respondents revealed that they do not have Aadhaar or ration card. These people feel that they are not aware of many things like location and availability of facilities provided by the government, and hence, they miss to get those services.

One respondent said that, *"When rain more, more dust. In the native place, we get good vegetables and food and here dust and surroundings are not good, so health is getting affected. This Bangda working environment is not good. For defecation, we go outside only, and mosquitoes are more here compared to native."*

Another respondent said, *"Here schooling... we are not able to send the kids to schools. Private is more costly, and we cannot afford. A government school, where it is we do not know. In native, we used to send to government school. Even we feel difficulty because of the language problem, so we hesitate to send"*.

## Discussion

The present study found that the study population migrated to the Bangalore city in their most productive age. Similar findings were reported by Rajan (2013). Census of India (2001) data stated that about 30 percent of internal migrants in India belong to the youth category (15-29 years of age group). As per the NSSO (2006) report, marriage is cited by women respondents as the main reason for migrating i.e. 91.3 % of women of rural areas and 60.8 % of women of urban areas migrated by marriage. In the present study, it was found that more than 50% of respondents cited in search of work or better earnings as the reason for migration. However, some respondents migrated due to marriage. In this regard, many other studies have reporting to uncover the more complex reality lying behind statistics and consider that women migrate for a number of other reasons that are not captured by census and macro-data surveys (Faetanini, 2013).

Majority of respondents have temporary kind of houses (hut, katcha, semi pucca houses, etc.), with not more than one room, without a separate kitchen, without drainage, without electricity, and without a toilet. This highlights their poor living condition with poor hygiene and conducive environment for diseases. All these poor socio-economic conditions put them into more vulnerability. The basic amenity for living, i.e. water is also a big problem for this population. The government tap or free drinking water facility is also not available for these migrants as they live in unauthorized slums or migrant settlements. The expenditure towards water is another hardship for them and for this reason they unable to maintain a good hygiene. The impacts of lack of basic amenities like sanitation, garbage disposal, and potable water on health on the one hand, and accessibility of quality health facilities on the other, make the urban poor vulnerable to health shocks. The onus of slum development has been mostly on the government, and it does not seem as though it has succeeded to provide a clean environment and adequate basic facilities; in fact, the situation has remained almost static for the past several years (Gupta, 2012). The basic infrastructure is lacking, and it is a big threat to health for these migrant slums and settlements. Bhojani et. al. (2013) also demonstrated that socioeconomic gradient with people living below the poverty line at significantly greater odds of reporting chronic conditions that people living above the poverty line.

Many people do not have BPL (ration) card and those who are having they got it in their native place, which is of no use in the current habitat. So in this way the study population is living in the city without any identity proof and hence, they are denied to get the government benefits under various schemes for education, health, shelter, and finally they became the exclusion group. This issue was highlighted by Borhade et. al. (2012), and they pointed out many recommendations for the betterment of migrants.

## Conclusion

Migration is an unavoidable situation, so the better inclusion of the migrants in the cities results in balance economic prosperity and social diversity. The study found that there is a lack of basic facilities including adequate and affordable housing, health and education services as well as infrastructure and sanitation among these inter-state migrants. The absence of identity proof leads to lacking access and utilization of government services. Hence, there is an urgent need to develop migrant-sensitive programmes for the benefit of this population. Including this, provision of identity proof is the most required thing for these migrants, which can improve the quality of life by access to government services and welfare programmes.

## Acknowledgment:

This paper is supported by Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), New Delhi in the form of Post-doctoral fellowship to the first author.

## References

1. Bhojani, U., Beerenahalli, T.S., Devadasan, R., Munegowda, C.M., Devadasan, N., Criel, B. and Kolsteren, P. 2013. No Longer Diseases of the Wealthy: Prevalence and Health-Seeking for Self-Reported Chronic Conditions among Urban. *BMC Health Services Research*, 13, 306. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-13-306>.
2. Borhade, A. Dey, S., and Sharma, J., 2012. *Towards a Better Response to Internal Labour Migration in India*. Institute of Public Health Delhi and Disha Foundation. Retrieved on 8/3/2018 from [planningcommission.gov.in/data/ngo/csw/csw\\_lobor.pdf](http://planningcommission.gov.in/data/ngo/csw/csw_lobor.pdf).
3. Faenanini, M. 2013. *Social Inclusion of Internal Migrants in India*. *Internal Migration in India Initiative. Social and Human Sciences*, UNESCO, New Delhi. UNICEF.
4. Gupta, I, Mitra, A., and Jha, M. 1998. *Slum Dwellers in Delhi: An Unhealthy Population*. *IEG Working Paper No. E/ 194/98*, Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi
5. Gupta, P., Srivastava, V.K., Kumar, V., and Srivastava, J.P., 2012. Antenatal and Intra-natal Care Practices in Urban Slums of Lucknow City, UP. *NJIRM*. 3(4):15- 8.
6. Rajan, S. I., 2013. *Internal Migration and Youth in India: Main Features, Trends, and Emerging Challenges*. New Delhi, UNESCO.
7. UNESCO, 2013. *Social Inclusion of Internal Migrants in India: Internal Migration in India Initiative*.