

Research Article

Migration, Diversification of Livelihood Sustainability: A Case of Mankhurd, Mumbai

Sumita Sarkar

Dean, Institute of Business Studies & Research (IBSAR), Sector-15, CBD Belapur, Thapar Complex (3rd floor), Navi Mumbai 400614, Maharashtra, India.

Email id: sumi.sarkar36@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present paper is an empirical one based on certain pockets of Mumbai which could be called as a peripheral boundary of new Mumbai and old Mumbai. Mankhurd, is the focus of the study. Mankhurd an eastern suburb of Mumbai city comes under M ward (zone-5 as Mumbai has been divided into 6 zones. Mumbai is a complete urban area and divided into two administrative areas known as Mumbai and suburban Mumbai district from 2001 and its political, economic life is governed by one civic body – Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai, to work for welfare of its population in terms of providing all basic amenities and collecting revenues from city population). Focus here is squatter settlement in Mankhurd areas and its population living in slums. Some sections have very high population density. An attempt has been made here to know about various aspects of slum population as Information about the household, its members, living condition, and diversification of livelihood, etc. Data were collected from the head of the household or a responsible member of the household through a well designed pre-tested questionnaire.

Keywords: Diversification, migration, livelihood, squatter settlement, sustainability, semi skilled, labour force,

INTRODUCTION

Impact of urban development of developmental agenda, post-liberalised-globalised era has resulted in rapid growth of urbanisation and urban development. 'Globalisation trend' has pushed on restructuring of industries and zoning of land use and has consequently helped and promoted the economic growth in Asian megacities resulting in severe ecological, economical and social inequalities and widened disparities between regions and economic classes (Fujii, 2004). The influence of megacities expands even outside their city limit to the urban and suburban regions.

In the context of developing nations, it could be addressed as 'cluster development' of urbanisation where unplanned urbanisation has its own organic growth towards transformation from rural to urban fabric. In many places, when such process of development takes place, urbanisation and industrialisation lead to the failure of localisation of agriculture and diversification of local economy. Hence, concentration of the population in urban area in developing countries resulted in inequalities between urban and rural areas (Dalvi, 2000; Lucas and Stark, 1985). For example, Mumbai, Calcutta and Chennai metropolitan region in India have more than 50% of total population who live in the squatter settlements; most of them are migrants from rural areas. It is now widely recognised that there exists an economic, social and environmental interdependence between urban and rural areas.

Focus of the paper: The present paper is an empirical one based on certain pockets of Mumbai, which could be called as a peripheral boundary of new Mumbai and old Mumbai, Mankhurd, is the focus of the study. Mankhurd, an eastern suburb of Mumbai city, comes under M ward (zone-5 as Mumbai has been divided into six zones)¹. Focus here is squatter settlement in Mankhurd areas and its population living in slums. Some sections have very high population density. An attempt has been made here to know about various aspects of slum population as Information about the household, its members, living condition, and diversification of livelihood, etc. Data were collected from the head of the household or a responsible member of the household through a well designed pre-tested questionnaire.

Slum/Squatter settlement: A working Definition: The term slum in a general context is a heavily populated urban area characterised by substandard housing and squalor. The definition encapsulates the essential characteristics of slums, i.e. high densities, low standards of housing (structure and services), and squalor. The definition also includes the traditional meaning, that is, housing areas that were once respectable or even desirable, but they have since deteriorated. The condition of the old houses has been declining, and the units have been progressively subdivided and rented out to lower income groups. They are the inner-city slums. UN-Habitat (2003) defined slums as contiguous settlement where the inhabitants are characterised as having inadequate housing and basic services. NSSO 58th round shows that, while nearly 70% of non-notified slums lack 'pucca' houses, just over one-third of notified slums want these structures. Over half of non-

¹ Mumbai is a complete urban area and divided into two administrative areas known as Mumbai and suburban Mumbai district from 2001 and its political, economic life is governed by one civic body – Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai, to work for welfare of its population in terms of providing all basic amenities and collecting revenues from city population.

notified slums have no latrine facilities versus 16.6% of notified slums. The rapid pace of urbanisation in developing countries is generating greater demand for shelter, especially among poor families who lack income to pay for decent Mumbai city, a city for 'haves' and a city of the 'have-nots'. These two cities are within the same geographical territory but occupy entirely different economic, physical and social spaces Both depend on each other despite their economic and social asymmetry (for example, approximate 60% population are living in slum in Mumbai, majority creates a huge labour force for semi-skilled and unskilled population to serve the privileged section). Among these two, one is grimy (slum) and other one is neat (non-slum).

Thus, they are two distinct but inter-dependent existences and give Mumbai a part of its character. Mumbai slums have unique issues. They have to be seen primarily an issue of housing and basic facilities, and then as an issue of income poverty which calls for an altogether different approach. Providing adequate shelter in cities of developing countries has been a fundamental problem for national and municipal governments for more than a quarter of a century. Although progress has been made in dealing with housing problems in some developing countries, in many others housing deficiencies are likely to become more serious over the decades as urbanisation accelerates and as the concentration of poor households in cities increases (NSSO, 2010; Hall, 2000).

As per 2011 census, the total population of Mumbai was 12.48 millions. The city has experienced a substantial growth rate during the last five decades due to the high level of industrial development and growth in the suburban areas of Greater Mumbai jurisdiction. According to the 2001 census, Mumbai slum population was 54.5%. Provisional data from the 2011 census show that nearly 41.3% of the city's population lives in slums. Dharavi is a part of G north ward and its population is 5.82 lakh with nearly 60% slums. Dharavi is no longer Asia's largest slum. It is now rivalled and dwarfed by four slum clusters in Mumbai itself, some of the major slum-dweller's pockets in Mumbai and suburbs are Kurla-Ghatkopar belt (70%–80% slum population), Dindoshi belt (80% slum population), Bhandup belt (70% slum population), *Mankhurd-Govandi belt* (95% slum population). This paper focuses more on the diversification of livelihood and living profile at Mankhurd slum, highest dense in terms of squatter settlement in Mumbai.

Migration, Livelihood and Living in Mumbai Metro

Mumbai, prior to 1995 known as Bombay, is the country's pulsating, economic, cosmopolitan, prosperous city and the administrative centre of one of the Indian states, Maharashtra. Mumbai is spread over 438 sq. km and is the most populous city with 11.9 million people enumerated in 2001 though the census currently underway, it is estimated, could indicate a population of between 14 million and

15 million. Mumbai, being the commercial and economic nerve centre as opposed to New Delhi, the political and national capital of the country, is also host to the entertainment industry. The people of Mumbai are mostly recognised as being hard working. The rise of Mumbai is remarkable in the sense that it was once a set of seven small islands inhabited by mostly traditional fisherman. In the late 18th and by the middle of the 19th century, introduction of the railway network put the city at the centre of the country's trade and commerce and the consequent emergence of the port as a pivotal activity, rendered it truly the first Indian city to go international. In early 19th century, the flourishing textile industry led it to be likened to Manchester, as textile and textile-related employment was a major sustainer of its economy. But this ceased to be so by the 1980s because of a notoriously long strike by a militant trade union. Textile industry that was once main source of livelihood to thousands of workers coming from all over country now is a thing of the past, the shambles have now been reclaimed as real estate underpinning the growth of the service sector.

In the early 1980s, the decline of manufacturing industries, especially the downfall of the textile industry, triggered the emergence of various territory sector activities (service and IT).

Having been established as the financial capital of India, migration became inevitable of city profile since the early 1960s with manufacturing industry growing, particularly textile industries across the city of Mumbai. Such migration has been consistent over decades and has lead city towards population growth, population explosion and now it has even cracked the city limit and going beyond suburb occupying natural and public space of the city. A predictive pattern that sustains is that despite the city shifting its activity from the manufacturing sector to the services sector, the migration remains a consistent phenomenon.

Migration has always played a significant role in population growth of Mumbai city since the beginning of century though their share as a proportion has declined now. In the early decades of the 19th century, Mumbai was mainly growing due to migration. The 'natural increase' component (the difference in birth minus death data) was almost negligible till 1941. The decade of 1951–1961 recorded a nearly neat balance between migration and 'natural increase'. Since 1961, contribution of migrant labour force started declining but given the base effect, the absolute number continued to be higher. Migration's contribution in the inter-census decade of 1991–2001 to the total population was around 39% while the contribution by natural increase was 61% (Table 1). Table 2 shows the distribution of migrants who came from the other areas from within Maharashtra, of which Mumbai is the capital, areas outside Maharashtra and from outside the country. During the last 50 years, the level of migration has declined from 64% to 43% of the population. The immigrants' percentage shows consistent decline from nearly 3% to less than

1%. The most notable feature of migration is the decline in the percentage of migrant coming from other areas of Maharashtra and the increase among migrants from other distant states due to better transport and communications, nearly two-third of the population was reported as being born outside the state and one-third as within state. It may be retraced that many migrants in the later decade started settling with their families and their children born in the city were categorised as the non-migrants.

But the diversification in the means of livelihood for these migrants population occupational profile of workers in terms of their gender, age and migration over a period of time, these data varied in each respective decade since 60' onwards.

Table 1: Population growth in greater Bombay (Mumbai) during 1901–2001 (in '000).

Decade	Total population growth (in '000)	Natural increase	Net-migration	Natural increase	Migration
1901–1911	221	–129	350	–58.37	158.37
1911–1921	231	–168	399	–72.73	172.73
1921–1931	18	–58	76	–322.22	422.22
1931–1941	402	4	398	1.00	99.00
1941–1951	1194	243	951	20.35	79.65
1951–1961	1158	558	600	48.19	51.81
1961–1971	1818	947	871	50.50	49.50
1971–1981	2274	1203	1071	60.42	39.58
1981–1991	1682	1400	282	83.23	16.77
1991–2001	2053	1254	799	61.08	38.92

Source: Singh (2007), 0.317

Table 2: Distribution of migrants who came from out of MH and within MH during 1961–2001.

Type of migrants	Census year				
Total population (in '000)	1961	1971	1981	1991	2001
Migrants percentage	4152	5971	8243	9926	11978
Within state migrants percentage	64.24	56.48	51.03	37.31	43.29
Others State within country migrants percentage	34.09	30.70	28.13	21.11	26.48
International migrants percentage	3.37	2.3	1.51	0.79	0.62

Source: Op. cit. 2007

The proportion of employment in the manufacturing sector declined from 41% in 1961 to 20% in 2001 but increased in the trade and commerce sector by 18% and 33% respectively. Another major change observed is the increase in the self-employed workers as compared to regular wage and salaried jobs. The census data reveal that the work participation rate of males declined by 5% while the women work participation rate was more than double that at nearly 12% during 1961–2001. As per the Economic Census (2005), the number of non-agricultural establishments increased by 18% but employment in such establishments declined considerably by 17%.

Methodology: This study of the present theme is based on exploratory research design. A sample of 280 migrants was taken from few pockets of Mankhurd. These pockets are Phule Nagar, Maharashtra Nagar, Mandala, Shivenari and Ekta Nagar. Maharashtra Nagar mainly found migrants settled there more than four decades and migrants coming from other pockets of Maharashtra through the family and known reference. The selection of sampling was based on random selection. Apart from simple statistical interpretation, in-depth interview, focused group discussion, collection of life history were a qualitative input to strengthen the data and to have better understanding of the life situation and livelihood of these migrants. Men members/migrants have been considered as the major stakeholders, and women and family members (parents/children/relatives) have been considered as secondary agent in this paper. This categorisation was finalised after observing that most of the migrants (97%) were male representative where their respective spouses and family member gradually have followed them and settled in these squatter settlements.

Few significant observations from the present study are as below.

Demographic Profile

Table 3: Age distribution of the migrants

Significant observation			
Sr. No.	Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	20–30	36	12.85
2	31–40	97	34.64
3	41–50	87	31.07
4	51–60	44	15.71
5	61–70	13	4.64
6	71–80	3	1.07
	Total	280	100.00

Source: present study, 2013

AGE: Approximately more than 47% migrant population was young and adult youth group representing the youth demographic cohort between 20-40 age group followed by 31% a under the age group of 41 and 50 also could be considered as productive age group of respondents. Interestingly, it was observed that about 1.7% population aged 70+ chose to stay back in Mumbai, under extreme adverse situation as they either no relatives or family back home (in villages) or they were just helpless below poverty line and chose to stay till end of their life in this city. While interacting with this old-group one stated ‘this is the city I came from UP when I was young boy of 32, all that I did is taking up odd jobs and thought of two meals in a day, when I had left my village I had my drunken father and step mother: here, I never could settle financially that I would have my own family. I do not see any option other than staying here and end here’. The young population on the contrary has revealed much optimistic attitude towards the city and their present struggle with means of livelihood. A young man aged 26 stated ‘it has been only 3 years I came from Orissa, I have been sending money to my brothers’ education to my family and working in housing society as security guard and also learning other skills; I hope I will do better and earn more. In villages I did not have option other than joining my father for wage-based daily labour’.

It is important to mention here that inter-state migrants have an advantage over intra-state migrants; this sub-section focuses upon the distribution of inter-state migrants in the sending and the receiving states. With regard to inter-state migrants, the states of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh send out about 46% of the inter-state migrants and the state of Maharashtra receives more than one-third of such migrants. These states are also known for declining in agriculture since 1980s and the 1990s and even at present. In addition, higher rates of population growth in these regions have exerted severe pressures on land. Moreover, public programmes for poverty eradication and employment generation in these regions have failed to address these issues. Collectively, these issues have as ‘push’ factor for people as they hardly leave any other choice but to migrate and search for better employment opportunities elsewhere (Mishra *et al*, 2009).

Table 4: Distribution of migrants as per education and respondents, Mankhurd

Sr. No	Educational background	No. of persons migrating	Percentage (%)
1	Below 10th	173	61
2	Up to 10th	57	20
3	Below 12th	18	6
4	10 + 2	22	8
5	Below graduation	4	1
6	Graduate	6	2
	Total	280	100

Source: Mankhurd, Mumbai, 2013

EDUCATION: A similar study (Mishra *et al.*, 2009) reveals that labour market conditions can increase the probability of receiving a gainful employment and higher wages. These changes could be due to either endogenous element such as better search and work experience or with exogenous elements such as economic growth over time or education as tool to seek better alternatives and diversification in the nature of job. Present study showed that better education significantly has helped the migrants to move out of their origin and settle in Mumbai with comparatively better means of livelihood. Educated people stand better chances of finding well-paid and wider diversified job profile over the illiterate majority. Very little but about 2% of the migrants were able to seek better and more options of jobs over 98%. Thus, it also affirms that how individual characteristics like skill /unskilled (on the scale of HDI) along with the duration of migration affect the poverty status of individuals.

ETHNIC BACKGROUND: Ethnic Back ground: out of all the respondents, 62% are Hindu followed by the second largest ethnic group Muslim (21%), Buddhist (10%) and Jain (5%). Buddhist and Jain population were Maharastrian staying within the city more than 2 decades.

Table 5: Ethnic background of the migrant

Sr. No.	Ethnic background		
	Ethnic background	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Hindu	174	62
2	Muslim	59	21
3	Jain	14	5
4	Buddhist	29	10
5	Sikh	4	1
	Total	280	100

Source: Mankhurd, 2014

It has long been recognised that in urban areas, especially large cities, are places where cultural diversity flourishes. Cities which receive migrants from all over the world, exemplify the cultural, social, and religious diversities that many believe is a fundamental characteristic of places that will thrive – economically and socially – in the era of globalisation. For most cities, efforts to decrease social polarisation and manage diversity rely on the ‘bedrock’ social policies of public education, health care, and income support that are usually the responsibility of national and state, provincial or regional governments. But social inclusion also depends on the quality of the countless interactions that occur among the kaleidoscope of individuals, social groups, and institutions that exist in a city. In this respect,

city governments also have a responsibility to develop local policies that manage diversity and integrate newcomers and long-established residents into dynamic social, economic, and political environments. They also must take the lead in mitigating practices of exclusion and segregation that are so acutely felt in the places where people live. Social inclusion in urban places does not just happen organically (Ray, 2003).

Managing diversity and creating the conditions for social inclusion can no longer be a concern for old central cities alone. In many cities like Mumbai, majority of immigrants, both new and long-established have settled in the suburbs, not the traditional inner-city enclaves that are so dominant with local Marathi Hindu and Muslim from North India who came during the 1980s (Sarkar, 2008) and provide a ethnic landscapes of minority Hindu in western squatter settlement like Andheri (West) or Bandra (West), eastern Mumbai Like Kurla (East) contrary to Hindu majority in the pockets of Central Mumbai and eastern suburbs like Chembur, Mankhurd and Navi Mumbai swatter settlement. Post-1990s suburban neighbourhoods have emerged as new multiethnic immigrant enclaves in both new and established settlement in Mumbai (Sarkar, 2008).

Migrants: Pull and Push factors

More than 87% respondent revealed that mainly because of the job or to explore the sources of livelihood they have chosen Mumbai. Marriage as reason again constitute mostly ‘women’ respondent followed by 18% who really did not have any particular reason other than the cause that they wanted to me in Mumbai as Mumbai attracts glamour of the city for jobs, life and money.

Table 6: Reasons for migration to Mumbai metro

Migration reasons			
Sr. No.	Reason for migration	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	For job	175	62.50
2	To earn better income	64	22.86
3	Good job	11	3.93
4	Marriage	12	4.23
5	No answer	18	6.42
	Total	280	100.00

The commercial capital attracts both the skilled and unskilled workforce as the city offers opportunities of employment in the field of production, administration, non-manufacturing, trade, banking, and other services. What is worrisome is that large selections of these migrants are concentrated in the informal sector. This shows that employees are increasingly hiring works on contractual terms due to flaws in labour laws and other concerns. It is well established that the informal

economy grows because it subsidises the economy by keeping labour costs low. The contribution of the labour sector to the national economy is nearly 60% which makes the informal sector itself major employee in the biggest metropolis in the country (Shrivastav, 2011). The workers mainly work as masons, contract labourers, carpenters, plumbers, health aids as services boys in hotel and restaurants. Workers also are engaged in their traditional, occupations as extraordinary work (*zari*), tailoring, carpeting, and furniture, etc., and some have their own enterprises as vegetable or fruits vendor's tea stalls, etc. Other occupations are as attendants in health care, security guards, auto drivers, etc. Women dominated as domestic aids, vegetable vendors, contract labour, health attendants, etc.

Availability of Jobs for Migrants and their Identity Proof

It was part of the researcher's concern that all these migrants travelled from their original inhabitants to the Mumbai mega metro, whether they carry any official proof or later go for any further identification or just a part of anonymous crowd of millions. Further does having an identity proof help them to get jobs easier and or even without identity proof they can get jobs? Voter card, BPL card, Pan Card, ration card and driving license were considered for identity proof (during this time of study 'Adhar Card' was part of identification, which later any way scrapped by government) Significant 70% belongs to the grey areas of official identification in which 30% could show their ration card from their village. Driving license (23.21%) is mostly made in their hometown Less than 2% respondents made their license here in Mumbai. These respondents were second generation migrants and had their postal address in the Mankhurd area (legalised squatter settlement). About 75.36% are having their voter ID whereas a significant number (24.64%) are not even having any voter ID proof, more so due lack of awareness and many of them stated that they never voted and belong to under privileged class. They were not even having their BPL card for the same reason of being ignorant of their entitlement. It is very interesting to share, that migrants who had proper identity proof (like, mostly voter ID and driving license and pan card represented about 13.04% in the study) have been candid to share that such identification helped them to get job and there was less obstacle to prove their authentication and employer had more trust in recruiting them. Furthermore, respondents who were Pan card holders, majority of them (more than 80%) were small entrepreneur or having kirana shop (grocery shop) in their locality, have their postal address in Mumbai Mankhurd area and majority of them are Maharashtraian.

Table 8 states that most of the respondents were engaged (multiple choices) in monthly salary but on contract basis (64.29% and 96.42%), though it is further revealed that daily wage labour also constitute a significant numbers (20.71%) and followed by weekly earning (10.36%). However, while interacting with these migrants, it is further confirmed that uncertainty of their livelihood prevails

Table 7: Identity proof of the migrants (multiple options)

	ID Proof	YES	NO	With ID (%)	Without ID (%)	Total
1	Voter ID	211	69	75.36	75.36	280
2	BPL card	116	164	41.42	41.42	280
3	Driving licence	65	215	23.21	76.79	280
4	PAN card	43	237	13.04	86.6	280
5	Other	84	196	30	70	280

Source: Mankhurd, Mumbai, 2013

Table 8: Migrants and their mode of earning

Sr. No.	Mode of earning	Frequency			Percentage	
		Yes	No	Total	On	Off
1	Daily	58	222	280	20.71%	79.29%
2	Weekly	29	251	280	10.36%	89.64%
3	Monthly	180	100	280	64.29%	35.71%
4	Contract	10	270	280	3.58%	96.42%

Source: Mankhurd, 2013

amongst most of them as almost all of the respondents did not have a permanent job and mostly belong to unorganised labour force. Most of them (approx 76%) who are getting monthly salary also asserted that it is though their work reference and staying connected with the field more than 5 years or so. Rests of them (14%) have got their jobs through the reference of friends or relatives and they are new to the Mumbai metro and would take time to confirm their source of sustenance.

Table 9 revealed that a significant percentage (33.92%) of the respondents perceive that Mumbai is a better city in terms of exploring diversified job opportunities. This also gets further strengthened by the additional views like increasing price to earn livelihood and the need for earning more (13.9%) in Mumbai, a city of dream and opportunities (10.71%), and relatives (reference support) and friend have suggested Mumbai as the most appropriate city for their exploring better sources of livelihood.

In this present study ‘livelihood diversification’ refers to attempts by individuals and households to find new means to earn and to sustain in having better quality of life. The paper explores also another dimension that for moving towards city was a matter of choice or compulsion. Livelihood diversification includes few types

Table 9: The reasons for choosing Mumbai over any other city

Sr. No.	Why Mumbai	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Inflation	39	13.92
2	City of dream	30	10.71
3	Gives more opportunity	95	33.92
4	Suggestion from relative	33	11.79
5	For job	37	13.21
6	Big city	5	1.79
7	Friend suggest	6	2.15
8	In Maharashtra	17	6.09
9	No answer	18	6.42
	Total	280	100.00

of jobs, broadly divided into salaried, self-employed and waged labour. Similar study (Ellis, 1997) defines livelihood diversification as 'the process by which rural families construct a diverse portfolio of activities and social support capabilities in their struggle for survival and in order to improve their standards of living'. Research also confirms (ibid, p. 5) that livelihood diversification is not necessarily synonymous with income diversification. The present paper highlights in the later section that not necessarily migration, diversification of income played favourable to better life diversification of livelihood.

Partners of Male Migrants and their Parallel Income

The table revealed that majority (63%) of the respondents are engaged in earning their livelihood in Mumbai followed by a significant number of housewives (27.88%). But when interacting with these women respondents, the researcher found either they are very new to the city or very old to do any hard labour to support their family.

Table 10: Means of livelihood of the respondents' spouses

Occupation of spouse			
Sr. No.	Occupation	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Job	88	31.42
2	House wife	134	47.88
3	House maid	25	8.92
4	Self-employee	27	9.64
5	Peon	6	2.14
	Total	280	100.00

Source: Mankhurd, 2013

Else almost everyone felt the necessity for additional earning for the family. About 50% young house wives were found doing some home-based piecemeal work like making chapattis (handmade bread), vegetable cutting for mass cooking or making paper foil to sell to the shop keepers or some stitching work to earn something more to support the family. About 15% young girls are into beautician training programme and soon would be engaged as they stated to the researcher. Multiplying income majority of them found is compulsory and beneficial for their livelihood. A lady aged 30 enthusiastically said ‘I am doing this beautician job and the additional earning I am now using for my child’s education which otherwise with my husband’s income I could not even thought of living in this big city’.

Migrants and Means of Livelihood

A significant percentage (44%) revealed that most of the population who have migrated is wage labour and could be considered under semi-skilled and unskilled labour force. These labourers are mostly in construction workers either on infrastructure or in real estate industry. Other than this unskilled labours have been engaged under contractual jobs like watchman (4%), peon (2%), helper (4%), house-keeping (3%) and on charity (3%). These labour forces under contractual assignment are monthly paid unlike wage labourers. There were skilled labour forces like Tailor who are interestingly having a background of tailoring/stitching clothes at the origin of their birthplace/villages; 10% driver, as they either earned their skill or already had driving license. Men who had driving license are mostly inter-state migrants and Maharashtrian.

Table 11: Migrants and their varied means of livelihood

Sr. No	Means of livelihood	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Labour	124	44
2	Tailor	29	10
3	Driver	29	10
4	Watchmen	11	4
5	Shop	26	9
6	Peon	6	2
7	Carpenter	16	6
8	Helper	10	4
9	Pension	5	2
10	House keeping	9	3
11	Screen printing	2	1
12	Charity	9	3
13	Clerk	4	1

Source: Mankhurd, Mumbai (eastern Suburb), 2013

Work like screen printing (1%) and clerical jobs were learned by them and clerical jobs workers had educational background from 12th standard till graduation in their own vernacular medium. However, the wage labour force who came in majority to this metro looking for earning livelihood through their diversified means has stated that almost all of them have left their original means of livelihood. Out of 44%, a majority of them were farmers either having their small holding or in share with a big farmers and rest of them were wage labours in agriculture. These were a mix population coming within and from Maharashtra and outside the state.

Table 12: Original livelihood of the migrants before migrating to the city.

Original livelihood of the migrant		
Jobs	Working people (%)	Sample (%)
Agriculture		44
Carpenter	21	10
Tailor	14	10
Wage/Seasonal labour	22	61.6
Total	280	100

Other than Maharashtra they were found to have come from Bihar, UP, Orissa, Bengal and few from southern part of the country. Majority (76.2%) of the respondents stated that after migrating to Mumbai city, though they have gained opportunity to diversified means of livelihood, but their quality of life has not been improved. one of the respondent rightly stated “ the city demands lot more money than we can earn to have a better life. But many of us though struggling here, sometime are able to send some money back home”. However, migrants who were engaged in agricultural activities, and had small holding of land, precisely expressed that there was a sense of loss of identity from their ‘social standing’ back home to anonymity in the crowd of metro.

New economics of labour migration (NELM) offered a more subtle view (cf. Stark 1991; Taylor, 1999). Instead of perceiving migration as an individual endeavour, NELM perceives migration as the risk-sharing behaviour of households or other social groups, which enable individuals to diversify resources like labour in order to minimise income risks. Such theory integrates motives other than individual income maximisation that play a key role in migration decision-making. Migration is primarily perceived as a household response to income risks, since income (either in form of wage/salary) serves as income insurance for households in the place of origin (Lucas and Stark, 1985, p. 902).

In present context, such theoretical argument would be relevant to correlate similar observations from their root (origin) where they have migrated and may have left their family, land and some other immovable property to make a better life in the city. A significant number (more than 70%) of respondents asserted that

that their moving towards city like Mumbai provided rather comparatively secure diversified means of livelihood and therefore had helped spread the 'risk' opting for various sources/means of earnings to 'secure' their life and living individually as well as for the family.

Concluding Remark: The sustainable livelihood usually has three major dimensions that interlude each other, namely: agricultural intensification/extension, livelihood diversification and migration (Scoones, 1998). Identifying the various capitals that need to be combined in order to achieve a sustained livelihood is the backbone of the process analysis which is very critical in the pursuit of different livelihood strategies (Scoones, 1998). Furthermore, identifying the connections between the various processes such as migration and diversification as well as understanding the outcomes of combining the various processes to achieve sustainable livelihood, demand an understanding of these three factors, namely, agricultural intensification/extension, livelihood diversification and migration which could be relevant for the present discussion of migration process and diversification of livelihood in a metro like Mumbai. Migration, by sociological interpretation is a process where the movement of people from one place to another affects population size. There are two major types of migration, intra-state and inter-state migration.

What make people move from one place to another are the 'pull' and 'push' factors. The reasons may be natural calamities, war/civil war, or simply due to lack developmental opportunities, like for example due to poverty, infrastructure, capital or education and also sometimes, for better social security or political or religious freedom. But in developing countries like India, major shift of populations from rural areas towards urban sectors are mostly due to poor human quality of life and declining agriculture, more so ignored over decades to strengthen the pace of urbanisation and industrialisation. This has led to the failure of localisation of agriculture and diversification of local economy as an offshoot of such changing processes of socio-economic structure.

Findings of the present data revealed similar factors like increasing cost of livelihood, coming to the Mumbai metro as to fulfil their dream, a city of opportunities for all kind of human capital etc., that have lead to 'push n pull factors' for these migrants population in Mumbai metro.

In the present study, the findings related to the diversification of livelihood affirm that giving up their original source of livelihood, mostly agriculture, is an inevitable and atypical to majority. People who carried their traditional family-oriented skill like carpentry or tailoring, they could somehow find the similar jobs and few had been successful as well to start up their enterprise. Shopkeepers (9%), most of them are in fact into vending business of vegetable or groceries. Interestingly, most of them got occupied in some or the other sources of earning their livelihood.

But getting into wage labour leaving their individual identity of 'farmer' could be considered as a dent into social and economic developmental process.

It is important to mention here further that that internal migration is not merely a survival or 'crisis coping' strategy, especially on the longer term; internal migration can be a strategy that improves livelihoods in a more durable way as migration increases the chances of obtaining better paid urban jobs/wages and the presence of migrants in cities can facilitate higher education of younger members in their family who either staying back in the place of origin or have migrated with the prime earner migrants. Precisely, it increases the economic mobility in general and at individual level.

The present study was to explore the alternatives means of livelihood of these migrants who have travelled to Mumbai to secure their livelihoods. Findings revealed and assessed about people from rural areas who have migrated over past one decade or so, in terms of their basic survival and losses, the struggle to maintain their livelihood, diversification from their original entitlements of means of livelihood to several other modes of earnings, and also loss of their previous social-economic status/entitlements (unlike at their origin) due to migration to the city. However, some percentage of the respondents (approx 45%) strongly asserted that migrating to the city of Mumbai has increased their opportunities to seek diversified means of livelihood and therefore their decision to travelled from rural to urban was in the best of their interest.

REFERENCES

- Dalvi B, 2000. In search of Justice: Tribal communities and land rights in costal Maharashtra. *Economic and Political Weekly*, pp. 2843–2850
- Fujii T, 2004. Formation of multi-habitat toward a sustainable city. *Proceedings of The 3rd International Symposium on Toward a Sustainable City*, Toyo university
- Hall P, 2000. *Urban Future 21: A global agenda for twenty-first century cities*, Routledge
- Lucas REB and Stark O, 1985. Motivations to remit: evidence from Botswana, *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 89, No. 5, pp. 901–908
- NSSO, 2010. Employment and Unemployment Situation in India 2007-08, NSS 64th round (July 2007–June 2008), New Delhi: Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation, Government of India.
- Ray B, 2003. "The Role of Cities in Immigrant Integration", Migration Policy Institute.
- Sarkar S, 2008. Youth in organized crime in Mumbai: A developmental Perspective in *Indian Journal of Social Work*, Vol. 69, No. 3, July, 2008, pp. 297-480
- Scoones I, 1998. Sustainable Livelihoods a frame work for analysis. IDS working paper 72 build on discursion held at 1997 during the preparation for field ---- phase of the DFID ESCOR.

- Srivastava R, 2011. *Internal Migration in India: An Overview of its Features, Trends and Policy Challenges in Workshop Compendium* Vol. 2, National Workshop on Internal Migration and Human Development in India, Indian Council of Social Science Research, New Delhi, December 6-7, 2011. UNESCO.
- Stark O, 1991. *The Migration of Labor*, Basil Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.
- Taylor JE, 1999. The new economics of labour migration and the role of remittances in the migration process. *International Migration*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 63–88.