

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF MIGRANTS IN A BLOCK IN EASTERN UTTAR PRADESH

*Dr Rashmi Kumari
**Dr Mritunjay Kumar
***Dr S.C. Mohapatra

ABSTRACT

Introduction: - A scrutiny of the basic characteristics of India's population reflects a macro environment conducive to the increased transmission and incidence of HIV/AIDS and STIs. In many societies, it is reflection of increased sexual mixing at an age associated with general experimentation in all aspects of life. India has noted a decline in the proportion of older and elderly people; however the population remains young with 36% aged below 15 years (IIPS, 1995). **Material and method:-** Six villages from Chiraiyaon block within 2kms of Rural Health & Training Centre, IMS, BHU were selected namely Bariyasanpur, Barai, Rustampur, Umraha, Sandaha, and Khanpur & complete enumeration was done for conducting the present study to document the extent of migration in this part of country. A total number of 145 households were visited and out of which 220 were found working outside from the above mentioned villages. **Result:-** Among six villages overall migrants were 1.52%. Maximum number of migrant were from Umraha (2.28%) followed by 2.02% in Bariyasanpur, 1.78% in Sandaha, 1.29% in Khanpur, 1.41 % in Barai, and least number of migrant were from Rustampur 0.76%. Out of total migrants 97.3% were males while 2.7% were females. More than half (60.45%) of migrants were below age of 34 years and 39.55% of migrants were above the age of 35 years Majority of migrants were married (76.8%) followed by 20.9% who were unmarried. Most of the migrants (57.3%) had been away from home since 5 years or less. 27.3% of migrants had migrated since 6 years and above while 6.4% had migrated since >10 years. Uttar Pradesh (33.6%) and Maharashtra (33.2%) contributed almost similar no. of migrants while 13.2% of migrants were working in Gujarat. Majority of migrants (60.9%) migrated because of poverty or in search of better opportunities followed by 36.4% who migrated under villagers' influence. Most significant finding observed was that sizable proportion of migrants (44.1%) could not send any remittance to their household and 40% of migrants could send less than 2000 per month. Only 15% of migrants could send remittance in excess of 2000 per month. Further analysis was done by spss 19 version.

Key words: - Socio-demographic, HIV/AIDS, Migrants.

*MD (Community medicine), Assistant Professor, Department of Community medicine, SGRRIMS & HS, Patelnagar, Dehradun

**MD (Pediatrics), Assistant Professor, Department of Pediatrics, SGRRIMS & HS, Patelnagar, Dehradun

***MD (Community Medicine), Assistant Professor, Department of Community medicine, SGRRIMS & HS, Patelnagar, Dehradun

Introduction

The interrelations between the spread of HIV/AIDS and geographical flexibility are complex. As with most epidemics, the geographical spread of HIV is greatly affected by the movement of infected persons, but the infection itself may hinder such movement or may daunt the arrival of migrants in places with high prevalence.

Most studies on the impact of spatial mobility on the spread of HIV refer to sub-Saharan Africa. However recent research has also focused on Asian countries, mainly China and India. The mobility of young adults, often travelling alone is implicated in the higher prevalence of HIV/AIDS in urban areas. The focus of research has been on the of certain mobile populations – truck drivers, seasonal migrant workers, itinerant traders, commercial sex workers and military personnel-in the spread of HIV along stabilized transportation routes and in regions experiencing high mobility. Conflict and ensuing population displacement have also been the focus of attention (UNAIDS, 2004)¹. A majority of research studies have concluded that mobile persons are at a higher risk of being infected than those who do not move, regardless of overall prevalence levels at origin or destination, because mobility is associated with behaviour that increase exposure to infection. Those behaviour are related to predisposing characteristics (young persons are more mobile than older persons and risk –taking behavior is common among the young); changes in individual or family characteristic due to mobility; and exposure to new environments. Mobility often separates couples. Individuals who often spend time away from their spouses or regular partners are more likely to have other sexual partners, engage in casual sex, and be HIV – positive than persons who leave home rarely or never. Circular mobility or migration, involving frequent or regular stays at home, puts people at risk of infection at both ends of the move. In particular, migrant men returning from urban to rural areas have been implicated in the rural spread of HIV in sub – Saharan Africa (Pison and others, 1993²; Lurie and others, 2000)³. Yet the direction of transmission is not only from mobile men to women, in nearly one third of the cases covered by non –mobile women in rural areas to mobile partners (Lurie and others, 2000). Rural–to–urban mobility implies that individuals moving themselves no longer fall under the traditional community norms concerning sexual behavior and may find them in an environment conducive to high –risk behaviour (Decosas and others, 1995)⁴. The Preponderance of young adult men among mobile populations, such as agricultural workers and

miners, increases the likelihood of risky sexual behaviour .The concentration of male migrant workers, isolated from normal family life, increases the demand for commercial sex and facilitates the spread of HIV (Hunt, 1989). In china, studies conducted in selected provinces indicate migrants are over presented among patients with sexually transmitted diseases and HIV/AIDS (Yang, 2004)⁵.

Material and Method

Migrant data are very important .Whole district coverage is not possible as it is one man, time restricted study so sampling frame was designed. Simple Random sampling was used. The design of the study incorporated semi-structured interviews at several levels to get information regarding the variables under study:

1. Six villages from Chiraigaon block within 2kms of Rural Health Training Centre, IMS, BHU were selected namely Bariyasanpur, Barai, Rustampur, Umraha, Sandaha, Khanpur and complete enumeration was done for conducting the present study to document the extent of migration in this part of country. A total number of 145 households were visited from the above mentioned villages.
2. Complete enumeration of household from all the six villages was done. Head of households were interviewed to collect socio-demographic profile of the households.
3. From the complete enumeration, the households with the migrants were identified. Resident spouses and head of the household were interviewed to collect the necessary information regarding socio-demographic profile and other variables for married and unmarried migrants respectively.
4. Head of households were interviewed to collect information about migrant member's i.e. unmarried migrant members and migrant members who migrated with their spouses.
5. In this schedule information regarding migrant was taken into account including name, age, sex, education, marital status, occupation, duration of migration ,place of destination, place of residence ,people staying with him, reasons for emigration and return, amount of remittance sent, etc.

Result

Among six villages overall migrants were 1.52%(220).Maximum number of migrant were from Umraha 2.28% followed by 2.02% in Bariyasanpur, 1.78% from Sandaha, 1.29% from Khanpur, 1.41 % from Barai, and least number of migrant were from Rustampur 0.76%. Out of total migrants 97.3% were males while 2.7% were females .More than half 60.45% of migrants were below age of 34 years and 39.55% of migrants were above the age of 35 years, range were (16-86 yrs), Mean \pm SD = 32.82 \pm 11.74. Majority of migrants were married 76.8% followed by 20.9% who were unmarried. Only 7.3% of migrants were illiterate. About 33.2% of migrants were educated up to high school while 38.6% were educated above graduation level. Among these 98.6% of migrants were Hindus while 1.4% was Muslims. Majority of migrants belonged to OBC 67.3% category followed by General 25%.Skilled workers were 46.8% while 34.1% migrants were in service and 9.54% were unskilled. Most of the migrants 57.3% had been away from home since 5 years or less and 27.3% of migrants had migrated since 6 years and above while 6.4% had migrated since >10 years. Sizable proportions 56.4% of the migrants were staying alone while 40.5% were staying with their family or spouse. In Uttar Pradesh (33.6%) and Maharashtra (33.2%) contributed almost similar no. of migrants while 13.2% were working in Gujarat. Majority of migrants 60.9%) migrated because of poverty or in search of better opportunities followed by 36.4% who migrated under villagers' influence. Sizable proportion of migrants (44.1%) could not send any money at home however 40% of Migrants sent up to rupees 1999.

Table 1- Details of Socio-demographic Profile of migrants

Gender	(N)	(%)	Marital status	(N)	(%)
Male	214	97.3	Married	169	76.8
Female	6	2.7	Unmarried	46	20.9
Age Groups(Yrs)	(N)	(%)	Widower	5	2.3
<24	46	20.90	Education	(N)	(%)
25-34	87	39.55	Illiterate	16	7.3
35-44	55	25.0	Below 10 th	73	33.2

>45	32	14.55	Intermediate	46	20.9
			Graduate	85	38.6

Table 2 - Details of Occupational status of migrants

Occupational status	Migrants(N)	(%)	Residential partners	Migrants (N)	(%)
Business	16	7.27	Alone	124	56.4
Skilled	103	46.81	With wife	51	23.2
Unskilled	21	9.54	With family	38	17.3
Service	75	34.10	With brother	7	3.2
Student	5	2.28	Total	220	100

Table 3- State wise job preference of migrants among the study

States	Migrants(N)	Percentage (%)
Maharashtra	73	33.2
Gujarat	29	13.2
Jammu and Kashmir	6	2.7
Madhya Pradesh	7	3.2
Uttar Pradesh	74	33.6
Delhi	6	2.7
Assam	6	2.7
Rajasthan	7	3.2
Kerala	9	4.1
Abroad	3	1.4
Total	220	100

Table 4- Study of factors responsible for Migration

Factors	Migrants	(%)	Remittances	Migrants	(%)
Poverty /better opportunities	134	60.9	Below 1999	88	40.0

Family /villager's influence	80	36.4	4000-5999	13	5.9
Job /transfer	6	2.7	6000 and above	3	1.4
Total	220	100	Could not send	97	44.1

Discussion

National BSS has defined "Migrants" as single male (15-49 years) living at a place other than place of usual residence without spouse/family for the purposes of work and visiting hometown at least once in a year. Ideally the study should have been conducted for the migrant population of whole state but since it was a time limited single person post graduate research study, migrant population of six villages within 2 km of Chiraigaon primary health Centre was studied on the basis of various socio-demographic and socio-economic variables. Information pertaining to age, sex, caste, work place, duration, reasons of migration, remittance transfer and other factors for migration was analyzed, interpreted and discussed below.

It was observed that more than half of (60.45%) of migrants were young adults below the age of 34 years. Only 14.55% of migrants were above the age of 45 years (Mean \pm SD= 32.82 \pm 11.74). Similar findings were noted in a study carried out in this department previously (Farooqui, 2006)⁶. The trend was even more with poorer semi-permanent or temporary labour migrants (Srivastava 1999)⁷. 97.3% of total migrants were males while 2.3% were females.

The migration decision of an individual is influenced by marital status. It is observed that the distance moved by a migrant is closely associated with marital status and depends to a large extent on his responsibilities towards his family. In the present study it was observed that the majority of migrants were married (76.8%), followed by 20.9% who were unmarried and (2.3%) widowers. The findings are similar to that observed by (Mishra et al., 2006)⁸ who observed 88.1 percent of migrants were married and (Farooqui, 2006) who observed that 79.4% of migrants were married.

Selectivity of migration varies according to education too. Several studies have showed that there is bimodal distribution, highly educated and illiterate person migrate more. Also migrants are

usually more educated than non- migrants with respect to place of origin and less educated than non-migrants with respect to place of destination. One remarkable observation of present study was that only 7.3% of the migrants were illiterate. More than half of the migrants (59.5%) were educated above high school level followed by 33.2% who were educated upto 10th standard. Similar observation noted by (Farooqui2006) in which 13.7% of migrants were illiterate and 41.1% of migrants were educated above 10th standard and 41.1% were educated upto 10th standard.

Majority of migrants (98.6%) were Hindus while Muslims constituted only 1.4% of migrants. Majority of migrants belonged to OBC (67.3%) category followed by General category (25%). Migrants from SC/ST category were the lowest i.e. 7.7% .The finding of the present study was slightly different from that done by (Farooqui, 2006) who observed majority of migrants were from OBC category but it was followed by SC/ST category who were 25.8% and migrants from general category were lowest i.e. 13.1%.Job opportunities at the place of destination play a very important role in regard to the process of migration decision. In the present study 46.81% of migrants were skilled workers while sizable proportion of migrants was employed in service sector (34.10%). Those involved in business activities were 7.27% while 9.54% of migrants were unskilled .It was observed that majority of migrants (56.4%) were staying alone at their destination or place of migration while 40.5% were staying either with their spouse or family .Most of the migrants (57.3%) had been away from home since 5 years or less while 27.3% of migrants had migrated since 6 years and above. Only a minor proportion (6.4%) had migrated since 10 years or longer. This was slightly different from the results of Farooqui's study in which he found that majority of migrants (53.7%) were away from their place of origin for more than five years or more.

It was observed that majority of migrants (56.4%) were staying alone at their destination or place of migration while 40.5% were staying either with their spouse or family. In India, rural-rural migration accounted for roughly 62% of all movements in 1999-2000 according to National sample survey data (Srivastava and Bhattacharya, 2003)⁹.Workers from states like Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Orissa and Rajasthan routinely travel to the developed states of Maharashtra, Punjab and Gujarat for the transplant and harvesting season. Intrastate migration was most common and 33.6% of migrants were working in other districts of Uttar Pradesh. Maharashtra (33.2%) was one of the major destination states for migrants, an economically well-developed state but also

with high prevalence of HIV infection followed by Gujarat (13.2%), Madhya Pradesh (3.2%), Delhi (2.7%), Assam (2.7%) and Jammu and Kashmir (2.7%). Intrastate migration was much less (26%) as reported by Mishra et al (2006) and even lesser (9.1%) as reported by Farooqui (2006).

Migration is a routine livelihood strategy of poor households which helps to smooth seasonal income fluctuations and earn extra cash to meet contingencies or increase disposable income. Mobility occurs when workers in source areas lack suitable options for employment/livelihood and there is some expectation of improvement in general condition after migration. The landless poor, who mostly belonged to lower caste, indigenous communities, from economically backward regions, migrate for survival and constitute a significant proportion of seasonal labour flow (Study Group on Migrant Labour, 1990)¹⁰.

In the present study it has been observed that 60.9% had migrated because of poverty in search of better opportunities. Migration decisions are influenced by both individual and household characteristics as well as social matrix. Factors such as age, education level, and productivity and job opportunities influence the participation of individuals and households in migration, but so do social attitudes and supporting social networks (Rogaly et al, 2001¹¹; Mosse et al, 2002)¹². In the present study it was observed that 36.4% had migrated because of either fellow villagers influence or family influence. To know the influence of migration on the economic status of household the remittance sent by the migrants to the household was considered. Most significant finding observed was that sizable proportion of migrants (44.1%) could not send any remittance to their household and 40% of migrants could send less than 2000 per month. Only 15% of migrants could send remittance in excess of 2000 per month. When asked about improvement in economic status of family by migration of family member, majority of them had an affirmative.

Summary and Conclusion

Majority of migration from the study area is internal and is more inter-state migration than intra-state migrations especially to the high HIV prevalent states of the country. It is not the poor who are migrating, but the people from lower middle and middle income group households for economic gains. It was observed that more than half of (60.45%) of migrants were young

adults below the age of 34 years. Only 14.55% of migrants were above the age of 45 years. This clearly showed that young people in search of better opportunities migrate to different places.

Majority of migrants were married (76.8%), followed by 20.9% who were unmarried and (2.3%) widowers. Thus it can be inferred that family responsibilities are the major driving force behind migration decision. It was disheartening to observe that more than half of the migrants (59.5%) were educated above high school level followed by 33.2% who were educated upto 10th standard and only 7.3% of the migrants were illiterate. This clearly depicts poor government willpower and lack of opportunities for young an educated person that forces them to migrate from their native place. Most of the migrants (57.3%) had been away from home since 5 years or less while 27.3% of migrants had migrated since 6 years and above. It was observed that majority of migrants (56.4%) were staying alone at their destination or place of migration while 40.5% were staying either with their spouse or family. This was alarming as young uninhibited people because of higher sexual drive may indulge in unprotected sexual activities thus may fall prey to STIs or HIV/AIDS. Interstate migration (66.8%) was more than intrastate migration (33.2%). Maharashtra (33.2%) was one of the major destination states for migrants, an economically well-developed state but also with high prevalence of HIV infection followed by Gujarat (13.2%), Madhya Pradesh (3.2%), Delhi (2.7%), Assam (2.7%) and Jammu and Kashmir (2.7%). In the present study it has been observed that 60.9% had migrated because of poverty in search of better opportunities and a sizable 36.4% had migrated because of either fellow villagers influence or family influence. Most significant finding observed was that sizable proportion of migrants (44.1%) could not send any remittance to their household and 40% of migrants could send less than 2000 per month. Only 15% of migrants could send remittance in excess of 2000 per month.

References

1. UNAIDS analysis of Spectrum output and Demographic Health Surveys, country reported programme data and behavioural data.

2. Pison G, Le Guenno B, Lagarde E, Enel C, Seck C, 1993. Seasonal migration: A risk factor for HIV infection in rural Senegal. *Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndrome* 1993, 6:196-200.
3. Leynaert B, Downs AM, de Vincenzi I. Heterosexual transmission of human immunodeficiency virus: variability of infectivity throughout the course of infection. European Study Group on Heterosexual Transmission of HIV . *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 1998, 148 (1): 88–96.
4. Deschamps MM, Pape JW, Hafner A, Johnson WD Jr. Heterosexual transmission of HIV in Haiti . *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 1996, 125 (4): 324–330.
5. Yarchoan R, Tosato G, Little RF. Therapy insight: AIDS-related malignancies – the influence of antiviral therapy on pathogenesis and management. *Nat. Clin. Pract. Oncol.* 2005, 2 (8): 406–415.
6. Srivastava RS. Migration and the labour market in India. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 1998, 41(4).
7. Srivastava R.S. and Bhattacharya S. Globalisation, Reforms and internal labour mobility: Analysis of recent Indian trends. Paper presented at a seminar ‘Labour mobility and globalizing world: Conceptual and empirical issues’. V.V.Giri National Labour Institute, ISLE and IHD, Sept. 18-19 2002.
8. Mavedzenge SN et al. HIV self-testing among health workers. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2011
9. Marguerite Ndour and Isaac Minani, of Projects Sida-1-2-3 (funded by CIDA from 1993–2006); and all staff of the National AIDS Control Program of Benin for the implementation of the intervention and the conduct of the field surveys).
10. Sengupta D, Rewari BB, Shaukat M, Mishra SN. HIV in India, *Postgraduate Medicine* 2001; 15:91-8.
11. Reniers G et al. Steep declines in population level AIDS mortality following the introduction of antiretroviral therapy in Addis Ababa. *AIDS*, 2009, 23:511–518.
12. Mattson CL. RT Campbell, RC Bailey, K Agot, JO Ndinya-Achola, S Moses (June 18 2008). Myer, Landon. ed. Risk compensation is not associated with male circumcision in

Kisumu, Kenya: a multi-faceted assessment of men enrolled in a randomized controlled trial . PLoS ONE, June, 2008, 3 (6): e2443.

13. Pison G, Le Guenno B, Lagarde E, Enel C, Seck C, 1993. Seasonal migration: A risk factor for HIV infection in rural Senegal. *Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndrome* 1993, 6:196-200.
14. Ramasubban R. and Rishyaringa B. Treatment seeking by women in Mumbai slums. Paper presented at the workshop on Reproductive health in India: New evidence and issues, Pune, February 28-March 1, 2000.
15. Rao KS, Pilli RD, Rao AS, Chalam PS. Sexual lifestyle of long distance lorry drivers in India: questionnaire survey. *BMZ*. 1999, 318 (7197):1559.
16. Srivastava RS. Migration and the labour market in India. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 1998, 41(4)