CHAPTER 9

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION & SUGGESTIONS

9.1 SUMMARY

From the Analysis of the Cross Tables, 42.65% of the migrants are from TN; 31.91% are from UP; 10.13% migrants are from Andhapradesh; 8.81% migrants are from Bihar; 4.46% are from other states; and 2.03% are from Karnataka; 34.85% of the migrants are women; 61% of migrants from TN are males. Whereas, 68% of migrants from UP are men. From AP 78% migrants are men. Only in Karnataka women outnumber men. 40% of migrants from Bihar are women whereas 39% of Tamil migrants are women. 48% of women are from Tamil Nadu (Table 8.1). Migration from rural areas is almost 72%; 89% of migrants from AP are from rural areas; 73% migrants from Tamil Nadu are from rural areas; In all states under study rural migrants outnumber urban migrants except in Karnataka (Table 8.2). 32% of the migrants are less than 25 years old; 38% of UP migrants are less than 25 years old; Only 24% of Tamil migrants are less than 25 years old; 24% of overall migrants are older than 50 years; 29% of Tamil migrants are older than 50 years; Only 20% of UP migrants are older than 50 years (Table 8.10).

Around 57% of the Tamil migrants have migrated for employment; 61% of UP migrants have come for employment; Next to employment Marriage is the most-cited reason especially by female migrants; Only 2% of the migrants have come for Higher studies out of which UP migrants are in majority (Table 8.3). Around 72% of the migrants are either illiterates or up to middle school; 20% have completed SSC/HSC; Only 8% of the migrants are Graduates/PG; 82% of Bihari migrants have not crossed middle school; 72% of Tamil migrants have studied up to Middle school (Table 8.4). 33% of the migrants are unemployed which consists of a major chunk of females; Only 10% of the migrants are doing white collared job; 51% of the migrants either work for daily wages or self employed; Most of the white collared workers are from TN (Table 8.5).

45% of the migrants have migrated before 25 years or more; The decrease in the number of migrants with respect to duration of residence may indicate declining migration into Mumbai; In all the states no. of recent migrants is decreasing which corroborates the census figures showing
65% of all migrants’ family have family income less than Rs.10000; 70% of UP migrants family income is less than Rs.10000; 59% of Tamil migrants family income is less than Rs.10000; 80% of Bihari migrants have family income less than Rs.10000; Only 1.5% of the overall migrants have family income more than Rs.25000, where majority are Tamil migrants (Table 8.7). 93% of the migrants are married; UP has largest number of unmarried migrants. We observe that only one migrant is separated and is from TN (Table 8.8). 61% of migrants from TN have one/two children; 39% of UP migrants have one/two children; 12% of Tamil migrants have four or more children; 33% of UP migrants have four or more children (Table 8.9).

68.5% of the migrants from rural areas are males; Only 56% of the urban migrants are males (Table 8.11). 62% of rural migrants have come for employment; 51% of the urban migrants have come for employment; 29% of migrants out of which 67% are from rural areas have the reason marriage (Table 8.12). 33% of the rural migrants are less than 25 years of age; Whereas only 4% of the urban migrants are under 25; 95% of the rural as well as urban migrants are in the productive age group (Table 8.13). 73% of rural migrants have not been to high school out of which 22% are illiterates; 70% of urban migrants have not crossed middle school out of which 20% are illiterates; 7% of rural migrants are graduates/PG, where as 11% of urban migrants are Graduates/PG (Table 8.14). 30% of rural and 41% of urban migrants are unemployed; Only 10% of both rural & urban migrants are in white collared jobs; 54% of rural migrants & 43% of urban migrants are earning daily wages or self employed (Table 8.15). It is interesting to note that the proportion of urban unemployed is more and proportion of migrants doing white collared jobs are same for rural and urban.

72% of females as well as males have not gone for high school education; 18% of women have completed SSC/HSC whereas only 7% of males have completed SSC/HSC; 10% of females and 7% of males have completed Graduation/PG (Table 8.22). 88% of women are unemployed or housewives whereas only 4% of men are unemployed (Table 8.23).

45% young, 59% middle aged & 76% senior migrants migrated for employment purpose. 37% young, 29% middle aged & 17% senior migrants migrated for marriage purposes (Table 8.24). 60% of migrants under 35 years have not attended high school; 78% of migrants above 35 years have not gone to high school; Only 8% of migrants of all ages are graduates/PG; Out of the
graduates/PG 85% are in the age group 25-50 (Table 8.25). 44% of the age group of 25-35 migrants & 58% between 35-50 are self employed or earn daily wages; 41% of the senior migrants are engaged in daily wages or self employed (Table 8.26).

43% of Graduate/PG have migrated for employment; 33% of Grad/PG have migrated due to marriage possibly most of them being women; 61% of migrants who have not gone to high school have migrated for employment (Table 8.29). Quite ironically we see 2 graduates/PG are earning daily wages; As expected 82% of migrants up to middle school are daily wage earners; 11.5% of the illiterates are self employed which is quite commendable; 51% of the Graduate/PG are white collared workers (Table 8.30). 21% migrants who are illiterate migrants, 26% migrants who have done Primary school, 35% migrants who have done middle school, 49% migrants who have completed secondary/senior secondary & 70% migrants who are graduates/post graduates have family income above Rs.10000/- p.m. (Table 8.31). 67% illiterates, 54.5% primary school level, 32% middle school level, 38% SS/HSC and 19% Graduates/PG have more than 2 children (Table 8.33).

The following are the responses to the life satisfaction level and social inclusion levels of the migrants from different states:

80% TN, 82% AP, 72% UP, 93 Bihar & 79% Overall migrants Totally Agreed or Somewhat Agreed that they achieved their goal by migrating to this place. Only 5% TN migrants totally disagreed which is largest of all given states (Table 8.55).

69% TN migrants, 64% AP migrants, 72% UP migrants, 94% Bihar migrants & 71% Overall migrants Totally Agreed or Somewhat Agreed that the conditions of their present life was better than that of their previous residence. 14% TN migrants totally disagreed which is large compared to the other given states (Table 8.56).

83% TN migrants, 76% AP migrants, 71% UP migrants, 95% Bihar migrants & 79% Overall migrants Totally Agreed or Somewhat Agreed that they are satisfied with life in the present place (Table 8.57).

To the Question “If you could live your life over, would you come back to this place again?”

65% TN migrants, 59% AP migrants, 74% UP migrants, 95% Bihar migrants & 70% Overall migrants Totally Agreed or Somewhat Agreed that if they could live their life over, they
would come back to this place again. 15% TN migrants totally disagreed which is highest among all other given states (Table 8.58).

92% TN migrants, 83% AP migrants, 79% UP migrants, 96% Bihar migrants & 87% Overall migrants Totally Agreed or Somewhat Agreed that they are happy about their home life (Table 8.59).

76% TN migrants, 55% AP migrants, 55% UP migrants, 61% Bihar migrants & 66% Overall migrants Totally Agreed or Somewhat Agreed that they are happy in their workplace. 33% Bihari migrants totally disagreed which is largest compared to the other given states (Table 8.60).

16% TN migrants, 7% AP migrants, 26% UP migrants, 19% Bihar migrants & 19% Overall migrants Totally Agreed or Somewhat Agreed that they often go for family outings. 24% AP migrants totally disagreed which is largest compared to the other given states (Table 8.61).

37% TN migrants, 9% AP migrants, 19% UP migrants, 16% Bihar migrants & 26% Overall migrants Totally Agreed or Somewhat Agreed that they go out for long vacations (Table 8.62).

88% TN migrants, 86% AP migrants, 62% UP migrants, 84% Bihari migrants & 79% Overall migrants Totally Agreed or somewhat Agreed that they feel a sense of acceptance in the community activities (Table 8.63).

84% TN migrants, 87% AP migrants, 64% UP migrants, 95% Bihari migrants & 79% Overall migrants totally Agreed or somewhat Agreed that they have have love & respect for the local people (Table 8.64).

34% TN migrants, 59% AP migrants, 55% UP migrants, 86% Bihar migrants & 49% Overall migrants totally Agreed or somewhat Agreed that they would like to settle down in the place of current residence in their old age. 43% of TN migrants totally disagreed to the idea of settling in Dharavi in their old age which is largest compared to the other given states (Table 8.65).

46% TN migrants, 67% AP migrants, 34% UP migrants, 45% Bihari migrants & 45% Overall migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they feel loyal towards matters of migrated state. 27% TN migrants totally disagreed which is large compare to the other given states (Table 8.66).

80% TN migrants, 66% AP migrants, 68% UP migrants, 92% Bihari migrants & 75% Overall migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that if they have to go back to their native state for some reason they would miss this place (Table 8.67).
16% TN migrants, 28% AP migrants, 15% UP migrants, 17% Bihari migrants & 17% Overall migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they would allow any of their family members to marry a person from the local community. 73% of TN migrants, followed by 61% Biharis, 57% from other states and 40% UP migrants totally disagreed to the thought of any family member marrying a person from local community (Table 8.68).

52% TN migrants, 61% AP migrants, 61% UP migrants, 87% Bihari migrants & 59% Overall migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they are here not only for income sake but because they like it. 17% TN migrants agreed that they are here only for the sake of money (Table 8.69).

77% TN, 65% AP, 48% UP, 42% Bihari & 64% Overall migrants Totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they have friends from other communities. 15% Biharis, 10% UP & 9% AP migrants told they don’t have friends from other community (Table 8.70).

23% TN migrants, 14% AP migrants, 18% UP migrants, 21% Bihari migrants & 20% Overall migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they go out with their friends. 26% AP, 24% Bihari, 21% UP & 18% TN migrants said they never go out with their friends (Table 8.71).

58% TN migrants, 18% AP migrants, 12% UP migrants, 4% Bihari migrants & 34% Overall migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they take part in local community activities. 53% Bihari, 31% UP told that they never take part in local activities (Table 8.72).

78% female & 79% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they have achieved their goal by migrating to this place (Table 8.91).

68% female & 73% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that the conditions of their present life is better than that of their previous residence (Table 8.92).

81% female & 79% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they are satisfied with their life in the present place (Table 8.93).

69% female & 71% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that If they could live their life over, they would come back to this place again (Table 8.94).

93% female & 82% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they are happy about their home life (Table 8.95).

34% female & 72% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that are you happy in their workplace. 52% female migrants said they are not at all happy in their workplace in case of male migrants it is only 2% (Table 8.96).
14% female & 22% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they often go for family outings (Table 8.97).
29% female & 25% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they go out for long vacations (Table 8.98).
82% female & 77% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they feel a sense of acceptance in the community activities (Table 8.99).
84% female & 77% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they have love & respect for the local people (Table 8.100).
48% female & 50% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they would like to settle down in the place of current residence in your old age (Table 8.101).
38% female & 48% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they feel loyal towards matters of migrated state (Table 8.102).
82% female & 71% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that if they have to go back to their native state for some reason they would miss this place (Table 8.103).
Only 19% female & 16% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they will allow any of their family members to marry a person from the local community (Table 8.104).
61% female & 59% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they are here not only for income sake but because they like it (Table 8.105).
60% female & 66% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they have friends from other communities (Table 8.106).
12% female & 24% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they go out with friends (Table 8.107).
35% female & 33% male migrants totally agreed or somewhat agreed that they take part in local community activities (Table 8.108).

It is observed that migrants from Bihar, though low in SES, have high percentages on both LSL and SIL scores. Their percentages in most of the SES factors was well below the Tamil migrants percentages still their overall LSL and SIL were better than that of all other states. This has been further substantiated by Descriptive analysis. Also by Correlation Analysis it is further proved that the effect of SES on LSL and SIL is low and that the effect of SIL on LSL is more.

The mean SESINDEX of Tamil Nadu is the highest with 124.78 and sd 35.52; The mean SESINDEX of Bihar is the lowest with 90.77 and lowest sd of 26.49; The variability in
SESINDEX of other states is very high (Table 8.128). Though Tamil Nadu migrants have the highest SESINDEX, it does not seem to reflect in their LSINDEX and SIINDEX. In contrast, Bihari migrants, though having lowest SESINDEX, they are happy with what they get as reflected by their higher LSL as well as better SIL. (Table 8.128, 8.129, 8.130). When rural migrants are compared with their urban counter-parts, though their SESINDEX may not be that much brighter, but their LSL as well as SIL are higher (Table 8.131).

As far as gender is concerned, though female migrants may be placed lower in the SESINDEX, their LSL and SIL seems to be not affected thereupon (Table 8.132). Similarly, migrants who are more educated have higher SESINDEX, but in contrast they don’t have better LSINDEX and also SIINDEX. The mean SESINDEX has an increasing trend in the productive years, thereafter decreases. It is surprising to observe that senior migrants ( >65 years old) have lesser LSINDEX and SIINDEX which means their life satisfaction level & social inclusion levels are higher than that of any other age group. But the variability for both LSINDEX and SIINDEX are higher than that of other age groups (Table 8.133). Migrants who have done up to primary education though not so high in SESINDEX, seem to have more LSL as well as SIL (Table 8.134). The striking similarity of these foregoing results reveal that the SES of migrants need not necessarily be a deciding factor in propelling a person’s LSL and SIL. SESINDEX of white collared office goers and Professionals is higher than that of others; White collared workers have more mean LSL and SIL (Table 8.135). Similarly the migrants who had come for pursuing higher studies have better SESINDEX as well as LSL and SIL. Migrants who came for marriage have the least scores on SESINDEX, LSL and SIL (Table 8.136).

There is a negative relationship between LSINDEX and SESINDEX though not strong (Table 8.137), ie. the higher the SESINDEX, the lower the LSINDEX (lower LSINDEX means higher LSL). Thus, it means that the more SESINDEX, the more LSL. But looking at the Figure 8.17, we see that R² Value is 0.018. This implies that only 1.8% of the variations in LSINDEX are due to SESINDEX, remaining 98.2% of the variations in LSINDEX are due to other factors.

The SPSS output PCM controlling the effects of the SIINDEX as shown in Table 8.138, reveals that there is not enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis and that the correlation is not significant with a p>0.05. From this we can infer that the relationship between LSL and SES is mediated by another variable SIL as seen from the Bivariate and PCM(Table 8.139).
Table 8.140 SPSS output of the BCM confirms that Correlation between SIINDEX and SESINDEX is significant in both Bivariate and from PCM (Table 8.141) ie. Partial Correlation between SIINDEX and SESINDEX when LSINDEX is controlled with p<0.05 with different levels of significance. Further a negative correlation is indicated between SIINDEX (lower SIINDEX indicates Higher SIL) and SESINDEX. Hence higher the SES the higher is the SIL. Nevertheless, we also observe from Figure 8.18, that $R^2 = .026$, which means that SESINDEX explains only 2.6% of the total variability in SIINDEX. 97.4% of the variation in SIINDEX is due to various other factors. Table 8.142 shows both the BCM and PCM together.

BCM (Table 8.143) and PCM (Table 8.144) reveal that the Correlation between LSINDEX and SIINDEX is significant with p<0.01 in both Bivariate and Partial Correlation Coefficient. This means that the higher the LSL higher is the SIL. We can also see the same from the Figure 8.19, Scatter plot of LSINDEX and SIINDEX, also since $R^2$ is .324, which means 32.4% of the variations in LSINDEX are explained by SIINDEX and the remaining 67.6% of the variations in LSINDEX are due to other factors. Table 8.145 presents both BCM and PCM together in the same table for better comparison purpose. Thus it can be safely assumed that SES is not a major determinant of LSL and SIL. Rather SIL is more responsible for a migrant’s LSL.

The correlation (which is negative) between LSINDEX and SESINDEX is significant for Tamilnadu and Andhrapradesh, ie. as socio economic status of a migrant increases, life satisfaction level also improves. Whereas, for the remaining states the correlation is insignificant (Table 8.146). The correlation between SIINDEX and SESINDEX (which is negative) is significant for Tamilnadu and Andhrapradesh which means as Socio economic status improves, so also the social inclusion level of a migrant. Whereas for the remaining states the correlation is insignificant (Table 8.147). The correlation between LSINDEX and SIINDEX is significant for all the states (Table 8.148). This further corroborates our findings that there is a positive correlation between LSINDEX and SIINDEX. As the social inclusion of a migrant improves it brings about satisfaction with life feeling in him.

There is a contrast with regard to men and women as far as the correlation between LSL and SES and also between SIL and SES. With regard to women it is observed from the SPSS Output BCM (Table 8.149) that there is no significant correlation between the SESINDEX and
LSINDEX as also between SESINDEX and SIINDEX both with \( p > 0.05 \). In contrast, we observe that in case of men, their LSINDEX has association between their SESINDEX.

But the Correlation between LSINDEX and SIINDEX is significant in both males and females with a \( p \)-value\(<0.01 \) (Table 8.149). From Figure 8.20 which represents the Scatter Plots for female and male, we can see that the variation in the Correlation coefficients between SESINDEX and LSINDEX, as well as SESINDEX and SIINDEX. The respective correlations for Urban migrants are stronger than that of rural migrants (Table 8.150).

It is found that the effect of SESINDEX on LSINDEX is less and that the effect of SIINDEX on LSINDEX is more. Hence we try to fit a linear Regression model of the Dependent variable LSINDEX to the Independent variable SIINDEX.

The SPSS Output Table 8.153 provides details of the model parameters (the beta values) and the significance of these values. \( b_0 \) was the \( Y \) intercept and this value is the value \( B \) (Table 8.153) for the constant. So, from the Table 8.153, we can say that \( b_0 \) is 19.455, and this can be interpreted as meaning that when SIINDEX is zero, the model predicts that LSINDEX will be 19.45. We can also read off the value of \( b_1 \) from the Table 8.153 and this value represents the gradient of the regression line. It is 0.700. Although this value is the slope of the regression line, it is more useful to think of this value as representing the change in the outcome associated with a unit change in the predictor. Therefore, if our independent variable is increased by one unit, i.e. if SIINDEX is increased by 1, then our model predicts that 0.700 will be increased in LSINDEX.

The t-test tells us whether the \( b \)-value is different from 0. SPSS provides the exact probability that the observed value of \( t \) would occur if the value of \( b \) in the population were 0. If this observed significance is less than .05, then it can be reasonably agreed that the result reflects a genuine effect. For these two values, the probabilities are .000 and so we can say that the probability of these \( t \)-values or larger occurring if the values of \( b \) in the population were 0 is less than .001. Therefore, the bs are different from 0 and we can conclude that the SIINDEX makes a significant contribution (\( p < .001 \)) to predicting LSINDEX.

Hence the Regression Model becomes

\[
LSINDEX_i = 19.455 + 0.7 \times (SIINDEX_i) \] 8.3
Using this model given in equation 8.3 we can estimate the LSINDEX of a migrant for a given score of SIINDEX. The statistical significance of this model relationship between LSINDEX and SIINDEX can be applied for various studies in migration studies, community welfare project assessments, sociological studies, etc.

9.2 CONCLUSION

Life satisfaction as well as social inclusion is a state of mind influenced by several variable factors which are rather difficult to quantify and measure. However to the extent possible an attempt is made in this research to convert it into near-appropriate index. The findings reveal that there is significant relationship between the life satisfaction level and sense of social inclusion and socio economic status of the migrants. Nevertheless, answers to certain crucial questions which measure the life satisfaction such as ‘Are you happy about your home life?’ ‘Are you happy in your workplace?’ have more significance in determining the happiness factor. It is found that 87% of Bihari migrants, in spite of being in low mean SESINDEX, have totally agreed that they are happy about their home life. As regards happiness in workplace, only 31% of them have answered in the affirmative. Though 63% of Tamil migrants are totally happy at home, and only 34% of them are totally happy at work place, and their mean SESINDEX is also high, their SIINDEX is very low. As regards social inclusion factor, 2 vital question such as ‘Would you like to settle down in the place of current residence in your old age?’ and ‘Will you allow any of your family members to marry a person from the local community?’, were very pertinent to identify their sense of acceptance in the local community. The responses were rather surprising. Though the Tamil migrants seem to be socio economically better off than their counter-parts, 43% of them have totally disagreed to settle down in Dharavi in their old age. In respect of many other states migrants like Bihar, U.P., it is in the range of 5 to7%. With regard to the next question, viz., marrying in the local community, the responses were astonishing, as it was in total disagreement in respect of migrants from all the states.

The cruelty of poverty and unemployment in rural areas, driving many of them to Mumbai in their quests to find jobs to survive is visible from the following answers :-

Majority of the migrants have come from rural areas, obviously due to lack of adequate employment and earning opportunities therein.
The education level of the migrants is quite low in most of the cases surveyed. Mumbai being a mega-city, provides employment avenues for the uneducated & even unskilled labor force.

Many have answered that they have achieved the goal of their migration; it is rather surprising looking into the poor living conditions in the slum areas. This indicates that the survival instinct has driven them from such far off places due to lack of gainful employment avenues therein.

Another surprising answer was that majority of them have stated that they are satisfied with their present life after migration, notwithstanding the poor sanitation, temporary sheds serving as homes, water & other essentials being difficult to get. This perhaps shows the extent of deprivation in their erstwhile places, mostly rural areas, from where they had migrated. This is further corroborated by their positive responses to a question asking them, if they were given another life, whether they would have come to this place. So also their response that they would miss this place underlines the dire need of jobs to earn and survive, even under difficult living conditions. This also signifies the extent of warmth and acceptance extended by the local populace to these migrants. So also, most of the migrants have expressed love and respect for the local people, showing their broad hearts and ability to adjust to new environments, once their survival quests are somewhat met, even with low earnings.

Yet another disappointing answer was in respect of their very low family outings – probably explained by their rigorous working hours and poor earnings.

9.3 SUGGESTIONS

Most of the migrants in Dharavi have settled there since very long. With lots of small /indigenous /cottage industrial manufacturing activities and employment opportunities in Dharavi, its socio-economic status is much better than many other slums. The migrants’ contribution to the State’s economy as well as exports and the benefits derived by the consumers by way of reduction in cost of production due to low fixed costs, etc. can’t be undermined. When we look at the severe constraints and conditions in which they live such as unhygienic atmosphere, severe air/water pollution, poor sanitation, over-crowding, sheds/shanties with poor ventilation and natural light serving as dwelling and working places, very narrow lanes as passages hindering emergency transports, etc., the value of their contribution to the society and
their hard-earned money is indeed much more valuable in real terms. However, it is seen from the present study that impact of such comparative prosperity has not touched the hearts of many migrants by improving their satisfaction with life. The planned re-development schemes for Dharavi with necessary industrial infrastructure for their livelihood should be accelerated. There should be community halls with recreational facilities for indoor and outdoor games, so that the various communities can inter-act amongst themselves to build a better bonding and relationship, to make them feel as a member of the society, an essential ingredient of social acceptance or rather social inclusion, a major subject of this research, which it has been found to activate life satisfaction, another major aspect of this research. NGOs and voluntary service organizations have a major supportive role to play in organizing various cultural, literary, sports, games and other activities by involving the migrants and the local people in this vital arena. Last but not the least important factor is that the Government should expedite the long-pending re-development plan and roll it out scientifically in a transparent manner after hearing all stakeholders. The day when it sees the light at the end of the tunnel would be written in letters of gold in the history of the State and serve as a trend-setter for various other slum-redevelopment plans and their execution in India in true letter and spirit!

How to restrict such massive migration from rural & interior parts of the nation to mega cities is indeed a major question. We have to develop the rural & semi-urban areas to a great extent, by encouraging cottage & village industries, tiny sector, many small projects aimed at tapping the local resources & manpower, to generate gainful employment opportunities to the local populate. Many are dependant mostly upon agriculture & allied activities, which are based upon the vagaries of the monsoon. Apart from addressing the main issues confronting agriculture and allied activities, a concerted and integrated approach with broad frame-work and vision are need of the hour to strengthen the backward rural and semi-urban areas, so that the migration to cities can be contained.

Another way to combat this large-scale migration from rural to mega cities, is to develop Satellite Towns in between, which would facilitate both the areas, as an intermediary station to benefit both segments. Such Satellite Towns can ease the excessive pouring of people into mega cities and also simultaneously balance the needs of the surrounding areas and their progress in envisioned long term plans.
There is also scope for further comparative analysis of migrants and natives of the state with regard to their SES, LSL and SIL. In future, when the redevelopment projects take off and Dharavi becomes a township in itself, another study of the these migrants may help to find out whether there is an improvement on these variables.

9.4 UTILITY OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS:

There was some interesting news items about some long stretches of slum areas in Mumbai city itself such as Kurla-Ghatkopar belt, Mankurd-Govandi belt, slum areas around Sanjay Gandhi National Park, etc. which were perhaps challenging the size of Dharavi slum. Of course it is learnt that the authorities were trying hard to remove the slum encroachments in some of these areas.

Thus the current research work and its findings have taken more significance than it was presumed initially. What have been found out by the lengthy research work? To put in layman’s words, “A migrant respects his self-esteem and wants to be recognized as a part of the society where he lives in; he gives more importance to this aspect (social inclusion) than money or status (socio-economic) and his life satisfaction is more dependent on his social inclusion level”.

The findings, though initially somewhat surprising that money and pleasures are superseded by craving for social inclusion, are in fact, in line with what the psychologists have been advocating since long, viz., ego-satisfaction is the rudimentary nature of mankind, as he is a social animal.

Again it was high time for us to recall the findings of the latest Census Report of 2011 that 78% of the Mumbai and its suburbs live in slums. Thus the Govt., NGOs, voluntary service organizations and other agencies will be busy in discussing and chalking out redevelopment schemes for these slums. Perhaps relocations schemes and satellite township schemes would also figure predominantly in their discussions. Whatever be the resettlement projects be contemplated, the vital underlying life thread of expectation of the migrants should be remembered, viz., they want their self-esteem to be protected; they don’t want to be taken for granted in their society. Hence they should be consulted well in advance before planning any such scheme. It may not be possible to please everyone, but at least a fair chance should be given that each one is heard in a democratic set up while taking a major decision!
Justice  delayed is justice denied is an old proverb. Dharavi redevelopment scheme has been shuttling here and there for several years. It is high time that it takes final shape and sees light of the day and brightens the eyes of several old and young inhabitants there!