



A STUDY ON IN-MIGRATION WORKERS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO GOKUL-SHIRGOAN MIDC- KOLHAPUR

Santosh Ashok Hodge

*Research Scholar,
Department of Commerce and
Management,
Shivaji University Kolhapur-416004
(M.S.), India*

Dr. Arjun B. Rajage

*Principal, Rajarshi Shahu Arts
and Commerce College,
Rukadi-416118,
Dist-Kolhapur(M.S.), India.*

ABSTRACT:

Human migration is one of the major issues in Globally. Migration means movement of human from one place to another place (region) by different types (Inter-state, Inter District and intra District) and reasons like unemployment, economical issue etc. To study aims to review the Type and Causes of in-migration workers in different working industries and migration duration. The Gokul-Shirgaon MIDC is 567 working industries and turnover around 6,000 cores annually and more than 12,000 workers are working in different organizations. It is the big production and workers are workings across the industrials area in Kolhapur district. Therefore, the researcher has selected to the Gokul-Shirgaon MIDC area. Simple random sampling was used to select 120 respondents from four chowk and select 30 respondents in each chowk. Based on data from a sample survey of 120 in-migration workers carried out during the month of October and December 2020 in area of Gokul-Shirgaon MIDC only. This paper analyses gender, age, residence, causes and type of in-migration, working industries, duration of in migration (period) and Income pattern.

Keyword: *Type and Causes of In-Migration, Working industries, Duration of in migration.*

INTRODUCTION:

Migration of human moment for one place to another place has different type of purposes like employment, education, business, marriage etc. It may come from distance point and another point of duration wise. The most of employees are come for different sectors like manufacturing and service based industries, construction etc. The under the industries are production of different types like Foundry, Textile, Lather, Printing and Publication, Agro-Based and Chemicals. Therefore, the different kinds of workers are requirement like skills, unskilled as well as Casual, Temporary and Permanent.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

B.C.M Patnaik (2015)¹ has studies that migration of rural to urban in different reason like economic factor, lack of income, opportunities in rural area and best job opportunities in urban area and also the income uncertainly in rural area and also simultaneous urbanization problem as attraction of young generation for Urban area. Balaji Kendre (2011)²has analyzed the socio-economic background in seasonal workers in nature of accommodation, nature of work, house hold income and education status. The most of workers in-migration reason is non-availability of livelihood income source in native place. Dilip Saikia (2014)³has studies the economic condition and also find out the major problems faced by workers within district for work. Madhu G.R.(2014)⁴analyzed in socio-economic conditions and unemployment reason and he has found that out the 95% of the workers are migrating because of seasonal employment, 98.2% workers because of poverty. Kavita Nachimuthu(2017)⁵ has defined the migration reason for rural to urban area because of low income and poverty. Dineshappa(2014)⁶has studies push and pull factor as causes of internal migration and has find out that majority of the migrants move within inter sate because of low agricultural productivities in their studies. R. Baral(2015)⁷ has studied of the nurse migration and identified the push and pull factors like higher education, living condition, stability, security and low income. Therefore, youths are going to other country. K Ponnusany(2015)⁸ has studied about different categories of age group of migration from one place to other place and found that 52% worker are migrating for construction work in within state and out of state. M Healthy Gnana Viji(2013)⁹ has studied an attempt to understand the factors that cause workers migration into pull and push factors like semi-skilled and unskilled migrant workers. Report Link (2017)¹⁰ - This report has been observed significant increases in migration of workers form one state to other as well as one district to another in the last 5 years. The new report based of migration Metric (CMM) shows that inter-state labour mobility averaged 6.5 million people between 2001 and 2011. The inter-state migrant population of about 60 million and inter district migration as high as 80 million. The Govt. of Maharashtra migration report-(2011-10)¹¹ This report show migration of people difference in NSSO 55th and 64thround in 55thround 2.3% migration in rural to rural area and urban area round to are 7.4%. India International labour Migration update report ILO office for India (2016-Augst)¹² shows the economic impact of migration on employment. The migration of economic population every year like 2005 is 4.94% and 2015 is 7.84%.

Annual Report of Government of India-Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs (2014-15)¹³ focused on migration flows of the pervasive economic and creates opportunities as well as challenges. Harender Raj Gautam(2012)¹⁴ has estimated that approximately 2million people are shifting from rural to urban area annually and approximately 22 million people have migrated from rural to

urban areas since 2001 in inter-state and intra-district for different purposes. Annuappa S. Vhasmane (2013)¹⁵ has analyzed the growth of industrialization and urbanization in Kolhapur district in cities in year from 1951 to 2050. In the year 1951 number of industries was 149 and in 2001 it was 1578. In Urban area in 1951 number of workers was 5946 and in 2001 it was 50338. Ramdas Bolake(2015)¹⁶ has focused on the artisans migration from rural to urban area for better job and earning opportunities in Kolhapur district around 50.4%. Maharashtra Human Development Report (2012)¹⁷ has shows that the net migration rate of the state increased during 10% in 1981-91 to 19% in 1999-2000. The intra state migration showed in the main divisions like Pune, Nashik and Kokan. It means migration is highest in Kolhapur district. Nisikant Singh (2015)¹⁸ has studies the levels of migration during the period of 1999-2000 and 2007-2008. Migration from rural to urban is higher and due to most of economic reason. Migration from urban to urban area because of better employment reason. Internal Migration India Initiative National Workshop-ICSSR, Delhi (6-7thDecember 2011)¹⁹ in its report focused on internal migration rate in India during the years 1981 to 2001. In 2001 migration rate in rural area was around 28% and in urban area was 35.5%. The rural to urban area migration rate was around 16.71% and urban to rural area was 4.2%. This report has studied distance wise migration rate and it was intra district 62.57%, inter district 24.12% and inter-state 13.31%. Shodhaganga (2013)²⁰ Year of 2013-14 shows that in Kolhapur city out of total migration 74.67% difference purpose.

In this present reviews of literature it has been pointed out that the in migration of workers come to Kolhapur so researcher has selected only Gokul-Shirgaon MIDC area because of in this MIDC is good production and most of workers are working . The research gap in the why case of in migration, what type of in migration, how many years staying and income status in MIDC area for in-migrant workers. The 75% in migration in Kolhapur city so this MIDC is connected with economically in Kolhapur city. Therefore, The workers are coming from other place (out of Gokul-Shirgaon in Kolhpaur MIDC) in different type and reasons. This study is used for the Kolhapur district and Gokul-Shirgaon MIDC for unemployment worker. The workers know which industries are selected in migrant workers and they have found out and implanted and improve the Socio-Economic condition.

OBJECTIVE:

1. To study the in-migrant workers in Gokul-Shirgaon MIDC.
2. To analyses the industries units are preferred by the in-migrant workers in Gokul Shirgaon MIDC area.

HYPOTHESIS:

1. The in-migrant workers are come for most of inter-state.
2. The in-migrant workers are most of preferred job in Foundry Industries.

LIMITATIONS:

1. The study only Gokul-Shirgoan MIDC.
2. The study only In-migrant works.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The researcher has selected 120 respondents in purposive quota sampling and collected the data in primary and secondary resources and that data analyzed by using statistical tool in such as percentage and hypothesis testing in Chi-square test.

1. Section of the Study Area:

The Gokul-Shirgaon MIDC was established in the year 1977 and it has area of 234 hecters. It has article 775 plots designed and around 567 industries are plot are function in different type industries like Manufacturing Industries units like Foundry, Textile, Milk Production, Machine Shope, etc. The MIDC industries turnover around 6000 cores annually and more than 12000 workers are working in different organizations. The data used in this research paper is based only on primary survey on the worker in Gokul-Shirgaon MIDC. It is the big production and worker are workings across the two MIDC and 5 industrials area in Kolhapur district. Therefore, the research has selected to the Gokul-Shirgaon MIDC area.

2. Selection of Sample Size:

A Simple random sampling method was used to selected 120 respondents from four chowk and selected 30 respondents in each chowk.

3. Data Collection:

The study has based on primary and secondary data were collected from primary with a structured interview scheduled and secondary for this study researcher has collected from article, reports professional journal and internet based.

4. Sampling Technique:

For analyzed using tools of percentage (Frequency) and descript analyses were carried out using SPSS and excel.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:

Following table shows the type of in-migrant of workers form out of Gokul-Shirgoan MIDC area.

Table-1 Distribution of Respondents as Per Type of In-Migration

Sr. No	Type of Migration	N &F(%)
1	Intra District	40(33.33%)
2	Inter District	31(25.84%)
3	Inter State	49(40.83%)
TotalNo of respondents and Frequency		120(100%)
Source: Filed Work (Primary Data)		
Note: F=Frequency,%-Percentage, N=No of Respondents(120)		

The researcher has selected 120 of the respondent's only in-migrant workers in Gokul-Shirgoan MIDC area. As per data in table No. 1 40.83% of the respondents in migrant workers has come from other state and 25.84% of the respondents are other district and 33.33% of the respondents are within district in-migration of workers. The inter-state in-migrant workers have high form other type of migration like inter district and intra district.

From the above table No. 1 it is concluded that 40.83% of the respondents are in-migration workers in inter-state from Bihar, Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh etc.25.84% of the respondents are in migration workers in inter-district from Solapur, Ratanagiri and Sangli and also 33.33% of the respondents are in migration workers in intra-district form Kagal, Ajara, Chandgad and Radhanagri tahsil etc.

Table-2 Distribution of Respondents as Per Type Gender

Sr. No	Type of Categories	Intra District	Inter District	Inter State	N &F (%)
1	Male	34(28%)	24(20%)	38(32%)	96(80%)
2	Female	6(5%)	7(6%)	11(9%)	24(20%)
Total No of respondents and Frequency		40(33%)	31(26%)	49(41%)	120(100%)

Source: Filed Work (Primary Data)

Note: F=Frequency,%-Percentage, N=No of Respondents (120)

Above table shows that 80% of the respondents are male and 20% of the respondents are female in-migrant of workers. 32% of the respondents are highest in inter-state in-migration of male workers and 9% of the respondents are inter-state of female in migrant workers.20% of the respondents are inter district in male and 5% of the respondents are intra district in female less come from out of MIDC area.

From the above table No. 2 it is concluded that the male are minimum in migrant workers form inter-district and female are intra-district where as the male and female in-migrant workers are high from inter-state.

Table-3 Distribution of Respondents as Per Group of Age

Sr. No	Type of Age Group	Intra District	Inter District	Inter State	N &F(%)
1	0-35(Young)	22(18.33%)	17(14.16%)	30(25.00%)	69(57.5%)
2	36-50(Middle)	15(12.5%)	12(10.00%)	18(15.00%)	45(37.5%)
3	>50(Old)	3(2.5%)	2(1.66%)	1(0.83%)	6(5.00%)
Total No of respondents and Frequency		40(33.33%)	31(25.84%)	49(40.83%)	120(100%)

Source: Filed Work (Primary Data)

Note: F=Frequency,%-Percentage, N=No of Respondents (120)

Above table depicts that 69.5% of the respondents are below 35 years age group and 37.50% of the respondents are middle age and 5% of the respondents are old age group. 25% of the respondents are high for inter-state in younger age group and 15% of the respondents are highest form interstate in middle age group. 2.5% of the respondents are high from intra district in old age group in-migrant workers. 14.16% of the respondents are less in-migrant from inter district in young age group and 10% of the respondents are inter district in middle age group and 0.83% of the respondents are interstate in old age group. From the above table No. 3 it is concluded that the 57.5% of the respondents are most of the in-migrant in interstate young are group and less in migrant from inter district (14.16%).5% of the respondents are low in migrants worker form old age group and also interstate too.

Table-4 Distribution of Respondents as Per Status of Native Place

Sr. No	Status of Native place	Intra District	Inter District	Inter State	N &F(%)
1	Rural	31(25.83%)	17(14.16%)	34(28.33%)	82(68.33%)
2	Urban	9(7.5%)	14(11.66%)	15(12.5%)	38(31.66%)
Total No of respondents and Frequency		40(33.33%)	31(25.84%)	49(40.83%)	120(100%)

Source: Filed Work (Primary Data)

Note: F=Frequency,%-Percentage, N=No of Respondents (120)

Above table reveals that the 68.33% of the respondents are come from rural area and 31.66% of the respondents are in urban area of in-migrant

workers. 28.33% and 12.5% of the respondents are high in inter-state workers come from respectively rural and urban area. 14.16% of the responders are less in migrants in inter district in rural area and 7.5% of the respondents are intra district in urban area.

From the above table No. 4 it is concluded that 28.33% of the respondents are in migrants form interstate in rural area. 7.5% of the respondents are minimum in-migrant form intra district in urban area.

Table-5 Distribution of Respondents as Per Causes of In-Migration

Sr. No	Causes of In-migration	Intra District	Inter District	Inter State	N & F (%)
1	Poor condition	18(15%)	10(8.33%)	23(19.16%)	51(42.5%)
2	Children Education	2(1.66%)	1(0.83%)	-	3(2.5%)
3	Low Wages/Salary	5(4.16%)	8(6.66%)	14(11.66%)	27(22.5%)
4	Mirrage	3(2.5%)	3(2.5%)	3(2.5%)	9(7.5%)
5	Employment	12(10%)	8(6.66%)	8(6.66%)	28(23.33%)
6	Not good climate	-	1(0.83%)	1(0.83%)	2(1.66%)
Total No of respondents and Frequency		40(33.33%)	31(25.84%)	49(40.83%)	120(100%)

Source: Filed Work (Primary Data)

Note: F=Frequency, %-Percentage, N=No of Respondents (120)

Above table shows that 42.5% of the respondents are poor conditions and 22.5% of the respondents are low wages/Salary where as 23.33% of the respondents are employments. The 7.5% of the respondents are marriage reason and 2.5% of the respondents are for children education and 1.66% of the respondents are not good condition in native place. 19.16% of the respondents are maximum come from interstate and 8.33% of the respondents are minimum come from inter district for causes of poor condition in native place. 11.66% of the respondents are maximum come from interstate and 4.16% of the respondents are minimum come from inter district for causes of low wages and salary in native place.

10% of the respondents are maximum come from intra district and 6.66% of the respondents are minimum come from inter district as well as interstate for causes of employment in native place. Form the above table No.5 it is concluded that most of the in-migration cause of poor condition, less of salary/wages and unemployment in native place.

Table-6 Distribution of Respondents as Per Occupation before In-Migration

Sr. No	Type of Occupation before Migration	Intra District	Inter District	Inter State	N &F(%)
1	Farmer	20(16.66%)	10(8.33%)	21(17.5%)	51(42.5%)
2	Job	8(6.66%)	11(9.16%)	18(15%)	37(30.83%)
3	Business	3(2.5%)	3(2.5%)	4(3.33%)	10(8.33%)
4	Education	7(5.83%)	5(4.16%)	2(1.66%)	14(11.66%)
5	Other	2(1.66%)	2(1.66%)	4(3.33%)	8(6.66%)
Total No of respondents and Frequency		40(33.33%)	31(25.84%)	49(40.83%)	120(100%)

Source:Filed Work (Primary Data)

Note:F=Frequency,%-Percentage, N=No of Respondents (120)

Above table shows that 42.5% of the respondents are farmer and 30.83% of the respondents are jobs whereas, 11.66% of the respondents are education and 8.33% of the respondents are on business. 17.5% of the respondents are inter-state in farmer and 16.66% of the respondents are intra district and 9.16% of the respondents are inter-district for job.1.66% of the respondents are not job, searching job etc. in intra district and inter district.

Form the above table No.6 it is concluded that most the most of respondents were engaged as farmer in seasonal farming form inter-state.

Table-7 Distribution of Respondents as Per Prepare the Type of Working Industries

Sr. No	Type of Working Industries	Intra District	Inter District	Inter State	N &F (%)
1	Foundry Engineering	17(14.16%)	20(16.66%)	21(17.5%)	58(48.33%)
2	Textile	6(5%)	5(4.16%)	4(3.33%)	15(12.5%)
3	Agro based Industries	6(5%)	3(2.5%)	6(5%)	15(12.5%)
4	Forest Based	2(1.66%)	-	3(%2.5)	5(4.16%)
5	Paper Product, Printing & Publication	3(2.5%)	1(0.83%)	7(5.83%)	11(9.16%)
6	Leather and Leather Product	1(.83%)	-	2(1.66%)	3(2.5%)
7	Non-Metallic mineral Product	3(2.5%)	-	-	3(2.5%)
8	Chemical	2(1.66%)	1(0.83%)	6(5%)	9(7.5%)
9	Other	-	1(0.83%)	-	1(0.83%)
Total No of respondents and Frequency		40(33.33%)	31(25.84%)	49(40.83%)	120(100%)

Source: Filed Work (Primary Data)

Note: F=Frequency,%-Percentage, N=No of Respondents (120)

Above table shows that 48.33% of the respondents are working in foundry industries. 12.5% of the respondents are working in textiles. 9.16% of the respondents are working in paper product, printing and publications. 2.5% of the respondents are working in leather and non-metallic mineral product industries and 7.5% of the respondents are working in chemical industries.

Form the above table No.7 it is concluded that 17.5% of the respondents are worker in inter-state working in foundry industries. Therefore, in-migration worker are working and preferred by foundry industries.

Table-8 Distribution of Respondents as Per Before Migration Monthly Income

Sr. No	Before income in month	Intra District	Inter District	Inter State	N &F(%)
1	<11000	29(24.16%)	22(18.33%)	39(32.5%)	90(75%)
2	11001-21000	2(1.66%)	3(2.5%)	3(2.5%)	8(6.66%)
3	21001 and above	-	-	-	-
4	Education student	9(%)	6(%)	7(%)	22(%)
Total No of respondents and Frequency		40(33.33%)	31(25.84%)	49(40.83%)	120(100%)

Source: Filed Work (Primary Data)

Note: F=Frequency, %-Percentage, N=No of Respondents (120)

Above table shows that 75% of the respondents are less than 11000 income group and 6.66% of the respondents are between 11001 to 21000 income group. 22% of the respondents were in-migration as education purpose. The income group is Rs.11001 to 21000 inter-districts and inter-state 2.5% both same.

The most of inter-state in migrant workers income are low from other income group status. As per the researcher has analysis most of the income less in in-migrants worker before migration in inter-state workers.

Table-9 Distribution of Respondents as Per After Migration Monthly Income

Sr. No	After income in month	Intra District	Inter District	Inter State	N &F(%)
1	<11000	3(2.5%)	2(1.66%)	5(4.16%)	10(8.33%)
2	11001-21000	30(%)	24(20%)	35(29.19%)	89(74.16%)
3	21001 and above	7(5.83%)	5(4.16%)	9(7.5%)	21(17.5%)
Total No of respondents and Frequency		40(33.33%)	31(25.84%)	49(40.83%)	120(100%)

Source: Filed Work (Primary Data)

Note: F=Frequency, %-Percentage, N=No of Respondents (120)

Above table shows that 8.33% of the respondents are income less than Rs. 11000 and 74.16% of the respondents are between 11001 to 21000 income group. 17.5% of the respondents are between 21001 and above. 35% of the respondents are highly growth in income of interstate in-migrant workers.

As compare the income is higher from before in migration i.e. before migration workers are low income and also not more than 21000 income group but after migration income group is good.

FINDING:

The type of in-migration workers showed the 40.9% interstate are represented and intra district is 33.33% showed it means intra district migration of worker is minimum from native place and most of out of state workers are in migration in MIDC area. The genders were 80% and 20% respectively male and female. The gender was show 32% interstate migration in male and 9% were female so it was shown interstate male and female in migration is high. The most of residential was on rental basis and they were staying with family. The young generation has in migration are high as well as interstate workers are in migration in young and middle age group and intra district workers are in migrated in old age group. The most of in-migration in rural area 68.33% and 31.66% are urban area. The in migration worker major cause of poor condition and unemployment in destination (Native place). Inter sate most of causes in poor condition and low wages and most of in-migrant farmer in native place and some was jobs. The most of worker before migration worker as farmer sector around 42.50% and interstate in-migration high. The foundry industries select for workers in skilled and unskilled and not worker any other jobs as part time. An inter-state worker was worked in other jobs and intra district not workers in other job. The respondent migration in between 4 to 16 years group in destination in and less in duration of less than 4 years. As per result was shown income was low before in-migration and after migration was increased.

CONCLUSION:

It is interesting to conclusion that the in-migration of employee in the field of Gokul-Shrighaon MIDC Area. As per the research data randomly selected phenomenon's and it is result of in migration status, type and socio economics conditions. The analysis of the in-migration workers as understand the background of causes and type of in-migration workers and select the working industries. The most of male workers are in-migration in inter-state in young generation into rural area. The in-migration workers was working in framer sector there was low income (poor condition) and income was low therefore it has selected foundries units and stayed more than 4 years and income status are increase after migrations compare to before in-migration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

I would like thank to my research guide Principal Dr. Arjun Rajage, Mrs. Rajani Khandagle (Technical Officer-ICAR, CIFE, Mumbai), Damodar Dhanit (Mumbai) and my senior colleagues have given the assistance, advice and good support for research work.

REFERENCES:

1. B.C.M. Patnaik (2015).Journal of Business Management and Social Sciences Research (*JBMS&SSR*) ISSN No.:2319-5614 Volume 4, No.1, January 2015.
2. Balaji Kendre (2011). International Journal of Humanities and Social Science ISSN:2231-3532&E-ISSN:2231-2540,VOLUME 1, Issue 2, 2011, pp-15-21
3. Dilip Saikia (2014). Economic conditions of the migrant workers in Kerala: A study in the Trivandrum District, Journal of Indian Research(ISSN:2321-4155)Vol2,No4,October-December, 3346
4. Madhu G.R(2014). Rural to urban migration opportunities and challenges -International journal of advanced research (2014)-volume 2,Issue 6,389-394,ISSN-2320-5407
5. Birhanu Melesse, Dr. Kavita Nachimauthu (2017). A review on causes and consequences of rural urban migration in Ethiopia- International journals of scientific and research publication, volume issue 4 April 2017 ISSN-2250-3153
6. Drineshappa (2014). International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention ISSN:2319-7722,ISSN(Print):2319-7714. Volume 3 Issue 51 may 2014\PP.19-24
7. R Baral(2015).Factors Influencing Migration among Nepahal Nurese, Journal of Chitwan Medical College 2015;5(12):25-29 ISSN 2091-2412
8. Gender issues and livelihood pattern of migration women labouries of form families(*Indian Journal of agricultural science* 85(1) 1428-34, November
9. M Healthy Gnana Viji(2013). Researchers World -Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce E-ISSN 2229-4686, ISSN 2231-4172Vol.-IV, Issue-1, January 2013 [128]
10. <https://www.businesstoday.in/union-budget-2017-18/news/economic-survey-2017-significant-uptick-in-migration-of-labour/story/245274.html>.
11. Govt.Maharashtra 2010-A report on 'Migration participation based on data collected in sate sample of 64th round of national sample survey NSS64th 10 [1] 2 migration –vol-19 Apr 2010.
12. India International labour Migration update report-2016.ILO country office for India

13. Annual Report of Government of India 2014-15. Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs
14. Ministry Of Rural Development Report-2012. Vol. 60 No. 4 Pages 52
15. Phd Thesis(2013)- Shivaji university Kolhapur. "Trends of urbanization and industrialization in Kolhapur district with special reference to Ichalkarnji"
16. Phd Thesis(2015) -Department of commerce in Shivaji University Kolhapur. "Impact of new economic policy on the business of village artisans with special reference to Kolhapur district"
17. Maharashtra Human Development Report (2012). Towards Inclusive Human development report.
18. Nishikant Singh (2015). Gender dimensions of migration in Urban India, Published in S. Trudaya Rajan (Ed) India and Migration Report 2015: Gender and Migration (Ed) Rutledge New Delhi, pp 176-190
19. Internal migration in India initiative National workshop on internal migration and human development in India 6-7 December 2011. (ICSSR) New Delhi, India vol-2 workshop paper.
20. <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/146878/10/10%20urbanization%20and%20industrialization.pdf>