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**Abstract**

Unemployment and income are main reasons to move and most of the moves are related to job or occupational changes. Due to lack of skills and educational qualifications, very limited opportunities are available in the high productivity industrial and service sector in the urban areas. So, these migrants seek employment in less productive activities in the urban informal sector. To analyse occupational pattern and mobility of migrant workers in Tirupur Garment industry, 1289 samples (825 male and 464 female) were collected from various garment processing units like Knitting, Dying and Bleaching, Compacting, Embroidery and Finishing units in and around Tirupur. The logit regression model was used to analyse the occupational mobility of Migrant workers. The results suggested that age and training variables have negative influence and experience and income variables are positive influence with occupational mobility of migrant workers. Education does not shown any impact on the occupational mobility of migrant workers.
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**Introduction**

Occupational Mobility is one of the most important processes that are associated with labour migration. The most typical picture found in migration studies is a very high proportion of young people who contribute the most to the labour force. Unemployment and income are main reasons to move and most of the moves are related to job or occupational changes. Apparently, some migrants suffer from underemployment and marginal occupation while others have managed to overcome such difficulties. Occupational mobility for workers has been measured in terms of caste, skill and educational background, but the physical segmentation of the labour market, which remain tied to their physical boundary due to limited mobility and accessibility imposed by cultural and social constructs has received relatively less attention.

The people migrate from rural habitats to cities especially metropolitan centers in the hope of employment. Due to lack of skills and educational qualifications, very limited opportunities are available in the high productivity industrial and service sector in the urban areas. So, these migrants seek employment in less productive activities in the urban informal sector. The income from urban informal sector occupations is too meager to afford decent housing. The central question we are asking in this study is: how long do migrants stay in one job, and what factors would determine the frequent changing of jobs?
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To answer these questions we focus on the occupational status and mobility pattern of migrant labour in garment industry in Tirupur. In the export garment value chain in India there are industrial clusters, which are linked to the global market. The pattern of labour absorption of Tirupur indicates that over the years, the proportion of migrant labourers not only from the southern districts of Tamil Nadu but also from the neighboring states like Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Orissa, Jharkhand, Utter Pradesh and Nepal have increased. The burgeoning growth of migrant workers in urban informal sector of Tirupur is the main reason to select it as the area of the study. It is generally believed that an unorganized labour market is characterised by low wage, long hours of work, poor working conditions, no upward occupational mobility, and lack of social security benefits, unequal pay and gender disparity. To examine this various statements migrant workers of Garment Industry, Tirupur have been chosen for study and data were collected from various sources.

**The Concept of Occupational Mobility**

Occupational mobility refers to the movement of workers from one occupation to another. The occupational mobility in the present context refers to the transition from one occupation to that of another. This may occur in two different directions, horizontally and vertically. The movement of labour from one occupation to another in the same grade or level is called horizontal mobility. For example, When a worker of a lower grade and status in an occupation moves to another occupation in a higher grade and status, it is vertical mobility. Just as a school lecturer becomes a college lecturer, a clerk becomes a manager, and the like. There are two related concepts to vertical occupational mobility that are upward occupational mobility and downward occupational mobility. The former discusses the occupational movement from the lower occupations to the higher within the occupational ladder. While the latter deals with the degradation of workers’ occupations from higher to lower one.

**Reviews of the Related Studies**

**John and Harris (1984)** examined the Occupational and spatial mobility of undocumented migrants from Dolores Hidalgo, Guanajuato and focused on the occupational mobility among a sample of recent Mexican patterns of undocumented migrants to the US. **Ogena and De Jong (1999)** explored the impact of temporary and more permanent internal migration, along with family resources and individual human capital attributes, on upward and downward job transitions of workers in Thailand. **Yu Chen (2005)** addressed the study assessed whether residential status affects individuals’ occupations and upward occupational mobility. **Bukhari M. Yusuf (2008)** studied Occupational Mobility Among indonesian Immigrants with Special Reference to Acehnese. The result of the study, further, indicates that the upward mobility depends upon the interplay of various factors. Those factors are the possession of human capital (on-job-skill or work-related skill, experience and knowledge of the market), structural factor (the openness of opportunities, access to the authority and sympathy of local people), cultural factors (the ability to adapt to the culture of local people), personal characters (hard work, strong determination to success and honesty) and social capital (help from local friends, help from Acehnese friends and relatives). **Ke-Qing Han *etal.* (2011)** examined Social Mobility of Migrant Peasant Workers in China. Using case interviews of 109 migrant peasant workers from 2005, this study qualitatively explores the status attainment and contributing factors to social mobility among migrant peasant workers in four cities (Shenzhen, Suzhou, Chengdu and Beijing) in China between July and November of 2005. **AslanZorlu (2016) studied** Immigrants’ occupational mobility—Down and back up again based on ECD migration statistics 2014 data analysed the occupational mobility of immigrants different adjustment patterns depending on the reason for migration. **Sam Friedman and Lindsey Macmillan (2017)** explored the regional differences in the patterning of occupational social mobility in the UK then they examine this Inner London effect further, finding that it is driven in part by two dimensions of migration. First, among international migrants, they found strikingly low rates of upward mobility and high rates of downward mobility. Second, among domestic migrants, the researcher found a striking overrepresentation of those from professional and managerial backgrounds.

**Objectives of the study**

The main objectives of the study are

1. To analyse the patterns of occupational mobility of migrant workers in Tirupur garment industry.
2. To examine the determinants of occupational mobility.
3. To analyse the income mobility, frequency of job change and length of stay of the migrant workers.
4. To enquire into the attitudes and aspirations of the people towards the present and previous occupation.
5. To measure the occupational mobility of migrant workers in knitting, Dying and Bleaching, Compacting and Calendaring, Printing, Embroidery and Finished units.

**Data Sources and Methodology**

The garment industry in Tirupur consists of six major sectors viz., Fabrication units, Dyeing and Bleaching units, Compacting and Calendaring units, Fabric Printing units, Embroidery units and Finishing units. Data available with District Industrial Center (DIC), Coimbatore, Tirupur Exporters Associations(TEA), Tirupur, South Indian Hosiery Manufactures Association (SIHMA), Tirupur National Institute of Fashion Technology(NIFT), Tirupur. Regarding the number of units revealed that there existed around 5050 units (excludes other ancillary 1000 units), at the time of survey (2015-16), with majority (2501) being finishing units. The remaining are units for Fabrication (996), Dyeing and Bleaching units (498), Compacting and Calendaring (302), Fabric Printing units(496) and Embroidery (257).

At the Second stage, five percent of each processing units were selected, on a random basis, from the list of units. Thus, the sample units works out to 253, comprising Finishing (125), Fabrication (Knitting) (50), Dyeing and Bleaching (25), Fabric Printing (25), Compacting and Calendaring (15),Embroidery (13).In the next stage,total sample workers 1289 were identified from the total workers (15626). From the total migrant workers (1289), unit wise the number of workers amount to: Fabrication: 82 workers; Dyeing units: 84 workers; Compacting units 89 workers; Finishing units: 876 workers; Fabric Printing units:81 Workers; Embroidery units: 77 workers who were identified for our study. From each category, 15 percent of workers have been chosen randomly. Thus, the final sample migrant workers come to 1289 (825 males, 464 females).

The period of study is from September 2015 to December 2016. Data were processed by using simple statistical tools like mean and standard deviation for describing the sample. The Logistic regression model was used to identify occupational mobility of the migrant workers of the Garment industry in Tirupur.

**Employment and Mobility of Migrant Workers in Garment Industr**y

In order to track the mobility of workers, the present study includes the relevant data on the present job as well as three immediate proceeding jobs held by workers in the labour market Occupational mobility of migrant workers is given in Table 1.

**Table .1.Employment and Mobility of Migrant Workers of Garment Industr**y**in Tirupur**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Occupational Mobility** | **Knitting/ Fabrication** | **Dyeing** | **Compacting** | **Finishing** | **Printing** | **Embroidery** | **Total** |
| Mobile | 68  (82.9) | 61  (72.6) | 22  (24.7) | 601  (68.6) | 44  (54.3) | 37  (48.0) | **833**  **(64.6)** |
| Not Mobile | 14  (17.1) | 23  (27.4) | 67  (75.3) | 275  (31.4) | 37  (45.7) | 40  (52.0) | **456**  **(35.4)** |
| **Total** | **82**  **(6.4)** | **84**  **(6.5)** | **89**  **(6.9)** | **876**  **(68.0)** | **81**  **(6.2)** | **77**  **(6.0)** | **1289**  **(100)** |

Source : Primary data

Of the total migrants (1289), more than three-fifths of the workers changed their occupation and nearly two-fifths of the workers had not changed their job in their labour market experience. The data revealed that 64.6 percent of the workers moved from first job to second job, Second to third, third to fourth or present job during their labour market experience.

**Frequency of Change of Job**

The workers too have to make the best of the season and earn enough money to maintain their households. So, they do not find it feasible to stay on in units indefinitely. When works stop or reduce in one unit, they are on the lookout for a unit that either has more work or pays better. The Table.2 shows that frequency of job change among the migrant workers.

**Table.2. Frequency Change of Job**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Change of Job** | **Knitting/ Fabrication** | **Dyeing** | **Compacting** | **Finishing** | **Printing** | **Embroidery** | **Total** |
| Retained First Job | 14  (17.0) | 23  (27.4) | 67  (75.3) | 275  (31.4) | 37  (45.7) | 40  (52.0) | **456**  **(35.4)** |
| Moving to Second Job | 49  (59.8) | 47  (56.0) | 22  (24.7) | 405  (46.2) | 40  (49.4) | 36  (46.8) | **599**  **(46.5)** |
| Moving to Third Job | 12  (14.6) | 9  (10.6) | - | 165  (18.8) | 4  (5.0) | 1  (1.2) | **191**  **(14.8)** |
| Moving to Fourth Job | 7  (8.5) | 5  (6.0) | - | 31  (3.5) | - | - | **43**  **(3.3)** |
| **Total** | **82**  **(6.4)** | **84**  **(6.5)** | **89**  **(6.9)** | **876**  **(68.0)** | **81**  **(6.2)** | **77**  **(6.0)** | **1289**  **(100)** |

Source : Primary data

Around 35 percent of workers retained their first job. They stayed in the same job. It also shows that some young workers for experience are not shifting to other jobs; Based on the responses of the migrants, more than two-fifths of workers in Tirupur changed their job two times during their labour market experience. Nearly 15 percent of the workers were changed their jobs into three times. Remaining three percent have been mobile, still they were in fourth job. The categorisation of workers was based on position. In case of finishing units, the percentage of workers who changed their job was very high as compared to other knitting, compacting, printing, dyeing and embroidery.

**Length of Stay**

Over the years in the garment industry, more workers stayed for longer period in the present jobs. It is significant that in the first job, one-third of the workers stayed 25 to 60 months. More than one-fourth of workers had experience of 13 to 24 months. In the second job category, more than one-third of workers had no second job in the labour market experience. Around 34 percent of the workers were stayed one to two years in the second job category whereas one-fourth of workers had less than one year experience. In the third job category, two-fifths of workers have taken the opportunity to work for upto seven to twelve months. Nearly 16 percent of workers had one to two years of experience.

**Table .3. Length of Stay in the First, Second, Third, Fourth and Present Job.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Labour Market Experience** | **First Job** | **Second Job** | **Third Job** | **Fourth Job** | **Present Job** |
| No Second / Third/Fourth Job | \_ | 456  (35.4) | 1098  (85.2) | 1246  (96.7) | \_ |
| Up to 6 months | 141  (10.9) | 35  (4.2) | 13  (6.8) | 8  (18.6) | 156  (12.1) |
| 7 to 12 months | 226  (17.5) | 165  (19.8) | 73  (38.2) | 10  (23.2) | 263  (20.4) |
| 13 to 24 months | 355  (27.6) | 280  (33.6) | 30  (15.7) | 11  (25.6) | 369  (28.6) |
| 25 to 60 months | 387  (30.0) | 212  (25.4) | 29  (15.1) | 10  (23.2) | 318  (24.7) |
| Above 60 months | 180  (14.0) | 141  (17.0) | 26  (13.6) | 4  (9.3) | 183  (14.1) |
| **Total** | **1289**  **(100)** | **833**  **(100)** | **191**  **(100)** | **43**  **(100)** | **1289**  **(100)** |

Source : Primary data

In the fourth job category, more than one-fourth of workers maintained their work for one to two years. Next to this category, more than two-fifths of workers worked for seven to twelve months and other more than one-fifths of workers worked for two to five years. In the present job category, nearly one-third of workers had a one to two years of experience; one-fourth of workers had a length of experience two to five years. Only 14 percent of workers had experience more than five years and 12 percent of workers had less than six months experience.

**Table .4. Income Mobility of Migrant Workers**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Income Mobility** | **First Job** | **Second Job** | **Third Job** | **Fourth Job** | **Present Job** |
| No Second / Third Job | \_ | 456 | 1098 | 1246 | \_ |
| Below Rs.50 | 198  (15.3) | 14  (1.7) | \_ | \_ | 42  (3.3) |
| Rs.51 to 100 | 229  (17.8) | 30  (3.6) | 6  (3.1) | \_ | 114  (8.8) |
| Rs.101 to 150 | 274  (21.2) | 132  (15.8) | \_ | \_ | 357  (27.7) |
| Rs.151 to 200 | 208  (16.1) | 103  (12.4) | 8  (4.1) | 2  (4.7) | 282  (21.9) |
| Above 200 | 380  (29.4) | 554  (66.5) | 177  (92.7) | 41  (95.3) | 494  (38.3) |
| **Total** | **1289**  **(100)** | **833**  **(100)** | **191**  **(100)** | **43**  **(100)** | **1289**  **(100)** |
| **Mean/income** | `**171.59** | `**180.30** | `**191.21** | `**243.21** | `**199.77** |

Source : Primary data

In the present job, three percentages of workers (42 workers) earn below`50 per day. While in the first job comparatively a higher percentage of workers (around 15 percent and in the second job only two percentages of workers earned up to`.50 per day. In the first job category the income earnings by the workers was high. In the category of per day earnings above `200 category was higher percentage of workers exists in the first job. In the second job, third, fourth and the present job category, the workers earn per day earnings of above `200 category was higher as compared to previous and first job respectively. The mean earnings of garment industry migrant workers was increasing from first job (`171.59) to second job (`180.30); from second job to third job (`191.21); from third job to fourth job (`243.21); and from fourth to present job (`199.77). Hence, it is explained that except in the fourth job, in the entire previous job of the workers, average paid was less than the present job. It is also clear that the main motive behind the workers to move from one job to another job was to earn more (income mobility).

**Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Fabrication (Knitting) Industry**

Based on the responses it was understood that two-third of the workers (833 workers) changed their job at the time of field survey. So, about three-fifths of the workers had changed their job, indicating a high mobility exists among sample workers. Under the process- wise mobility, the percentage of workers who changed their job in the fabrication unit was higher than the other processing units with respect to finishing, embroidery compacting unit workers. This was something peculiar so it varied between different categories of workers in different processing units. Occupational mobility of migrant workers working in fabrication units is shown in Table.5.

**Table.5 Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Fabrication Units**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Present Job** | **Previous Job** | | | **Total** |
| **Machine Operator** | **Helper** | **Student / Not Entered the Labour Market** |
| Foreman | 9  (36.0) | 16  (64.0) | - | 25  (100.0) |
| Machine Operator | - | 26  (100.0) | - | 26  (100.0) |
| Checkers/Cone winders | - | 10  (45.5) | 12  (54.5) | 22  (100.0) |
| Helpers | - | - | 9  (100.0) | 9  (100.0) |
| **Total** | **9**  **(11.0)** | **52**  **(63.4)** | **21**  **(25.6)** | **82**  **(100.0)** |

Source : Primary data

Among the fabrication unit workers, 25 workers were working as foreman at presently, and previously nine of them were machine operator and 16 were worked as helper. Around 26 workers belong to the machine operator in present job, the previous job of the machine operator was helper. Next to this category, 22 checker / cone winder in the present job, out of 22, previously, ten workers were helper and 12 were students or not entered into the labour market. Around nine workers were from student not entered into the labour market and worked as helper in the present job. The present job and previous job of the migrant workers in Fabrication units was clearly explained by the following Figure5.1. Nearly 75 percent of them were working in the previous job of the same processing units and 25 percent of them just entered the labour market before that they were doing their school education.

**Figure.1. Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Fabrication Units**
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**Number of Workers**

**Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Dyeing and Bleaching Units**

About 84 workers were working in the different occupations in Dyeing and Bleaching units as Dyeing Master, Assistant Dyeing Master, Lab Technician, Machine Operator, Boiler Operator and Helper in the present job. Among them, mobile from different occupations in the same industrial category, around 32 percent of them were not entered the labour market. Among the 84 workers, eight workers were working as dyeing master in present job. Two of them were in assistant dyeing master, two of them were lab technicians, and four workers were in lab assistants in previous job. Eight workers were working as assistant dyeing master in present job; previously three workers were in lab technicians and five workers from lab assistant category. From the total, 14 lab technicians were in present job, previously ten workers were in lab assistants and four workers from students category. Next category of machine operator and boiler operator as their present job, previously they worked as an operator helper. Around 23 helpers in the present job, previously they were entered as student not entered into the labour market.

**Table.6. Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Dyeing and Bleaching Units**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Present Job** | **Previous Job** | | | | | | |
| **Asst. Dyeing Master** | **Lab Technician** | **Lab Asst.** | **Machine Operator** | **Helper** | **Student/Not entered into the labour Market** | **Total** |
| Dyeing Master | 2  (25.0) | 2  (25.0) | 4  (50.0) | - | - | - | 8  (100.0) |
| Asst. Dyeing Master | - | 3  (37.5) | 5  (62.5) | - | - | - | 8  (100.0) |
| Lab Technician | - | - | 10  (71.4) | - | - | 4  (28.6) | 14  (100.0) |
| Machine Operator | - | - | - | - | 23  (100.0) | - | 23  (100.0) |
| Boiler Operator | - | - | - | - | 8  (100.0) | - | 8  (100.0) |
| Helper | - | - | - | - | - | 23  (100.0) | 23  (100.0) |
| **Total** | **2**  **(2.4)** | **5**  **(6.0)** | **19**  **(22.6)** | **-** | **31**  **(36.9)** | **27**  **(32.1)** | **84**  **(100.0)** |

Source : Primary data

**Figure.2 Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers of Dyeing and Bleaching Units**
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**Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Compacting and Calendaring Units**

Occupational mobility of migrant workers in compacting and calendaring units are given in Table.7.

**Table .7.Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Compacting and Calendaring Units**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Present Job** | **Previous Job** | | |
| **Helper** | **Student / Not Entered into the Labour Market** | **Total** |
| Machine Operator | 9  (100.0) | - | 9  (100.0) |
| Boiler Operator | 11  (100.0) | - | 11  (100.0) |
| Helper | - | 69  (100) | 69  (100.0) |
| **Total** | **20**  **(22.5)** | **69**  **(77.5)** | **89**  **(100.0)** |

Source : Primary data

Out of 89 workers, nine workers are doing machine operator in present job, previously they were in helper category. Next category of boiler operator as their present job, previously worked as an operator helper. About 69 workers were working as helper now, previously they joined as a new entrant. Nearly 23 percent of workers were from the previous occupation of the labour category of compacting units to the present occupation and remaining 77 percent of the present job category previously they were students.

**Figure.3. Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers of Compacting and Calendaring Units**
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**Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Printing Units**

Occupational Mobility of migrant workers in printing units is presented in Table.8.

**Table.8. Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Printing units**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Present Job** | **Previous Job** | | | |
| **Printer** | **Helper** | **Student/Not entered the labour Market** | **Total** |
| Designer | - | - | 9  (100.0) | 9  (100.0) |
| Screen Making Master | - | 5  (100.0) | - | 5  (100.0) |
| Shade Master | 2  (40.0) | 3  (60.0) | - | 5  (100.0) |
| Printer | - | 18  (81.8) | 4  (18.2) | 22  (100.0) |
| Machine Operator | - | 8  (80.0) | 2  (20.0) | 10  (100.0) |
| Helper | - | - | 30  (100.0) | 30  (100.0) |
| **Total** | **2**  **(2.5)** | **34**  **(41.9)** | **45**  **(55.6)** | **81**  **(100.0)** |

Source : Primary data

Of the 81 migrant workers of fabric printing units, their present job was designer, shade master, printer, machine operator and helper. Of the nine designers in the present job, they were belong to student category in the previous job. In present job, five workers worked as screen making master, previously they worked as helper category, five workers were doing shade master in present job, two workers were printers, and three workers were from helper category in previous job. Of the 22 printer in the present job, 18 workers worked as helper, remaining four workers were in student / not entered in the labour market in the previous job. In the present job, ten machine operators were working, eight workers worked as helper to the machine operator, two workers were in student category in the previous job. In the printing unit, nearly 56 percent of the workers were students before entered into labour market in the previous job. The present occupational status of workers, 44 percent of them were in the same fabric printing units with different occupational categories (lower level) and move to higher level of the present position.

**Figure.4 Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Printing Units**
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**Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Embroidery Units**

Occupational Mobility of Migrant workers in embroidery units are explained in   
Table.9.

**Table.9 Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Embroidery Units**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Present Job** | **Previous Job** | | |
| **Helper** | **Student/Not entered the labour Market** | **Total** |
| Frame Master | 5  (71.4) | 2  (28.6) | 7  (100.0) |
| Machine Operator | 25  (86.2) | 4  (13.8) | 29  (100.0) |
| Trimmer | - | 4  (100.0) | 4  (100.0) |
| Helper | - | 37  (100.0) | 37  (100.0) |
| **Total** | **30**  **(39.0)** | **47**  **(61.0)** | **77**  **(100.0)** |

Source : Primary data

The total workers of the embroidery units were classified into four categories viz., frame master, machine operator, Trimmer and helper. The present job category of frame masters’ previous job, five were helper and two workers were students when they entered into the labour market. Among 29 machine operators were doing their job at present, previously 25 of them were worked as helper and four workers were students. In present job category, four trimmers, 37 helpers were working, all of them have moved from student category and they were not entered into the labour market in the previous job..

**Figure.5. Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers of Embroidery Units**
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**Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Finishing Units**

Occupational mobility of migrant workers in finishing units is depicted in Table 10.

**Table.10 Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers in Finishing Units**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Present Job** | **Previous Job** | | | | | | | |
| **Cutting Master** | **Flat lock Tailor** | **Over Lock Tailor** | **Labeling &Packing** | **Checking** | **Helper** | **Student/Not entered the labour Market** | **Total** |
| Pattern Master | 21 | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | 31 |
| Cutting Master | - | 11 | - | 4 | - | 32 | - | 47 |
| Flat lock Tailor | - | - | 10 | - | - | 84 | - | 94 |
| Over Lock Tailor | - | - | - | - | 2 | 245 | 3 | 250 |
| Singer | - | - | - | - | 8 | 32 | 70 | 110 |
| Iron Master | - | - | - | 3 | - | 2 | 26 | 31 |
| Button Fixing | - | - | - | - | - | 22 | 9 | 31 |
| Labeling &Packing | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 91 | 94 |
| Checking | - | - | - | 2 | - | 25 | 98 | 125 |
| Trimmer | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20 | 20 |
| Helper | - | - | - | - | - | - | 43 | 43 |
| **Total** | **21**  **(2.5)** | **11**  **(1.3)** | **10**  **(1.1)** | **9**  **(1.0)** | **10**  **(1.1)** | **455**  **(51.9)** | **360**  **(41.1)** | **876**  **(100** |

Source: Primary Data

Out of 876 total migrants of finishing units, 59 percent of the workers had gained their vertical mobility in their occupation. They have moved from the very low level job or first they entered in the labour market in these units. The pattern masters had moved from as cutting master, helper category in the previous job. The next category of cutting master47 workers, eleven workers were tailors, 32 workers were helpers of tailors, and four workers were from packing in the previous job. The detailed analysis of the vertical mobility of finishing unit’s workers was given in the chart. Nearly 59 percent of workers had moved from lower category of the occupation from previous job to the present job position. Around 41 percent of the present job workers were the school students or unemployed or had not at all entered in the labour market.

The biggest proportion of sample was tailors (Tailors – singer, Tailor – flat lock, Tailor – Over lock). Some of the notable trends are, there were no woman in jobs like cutting master, iron man. Most of the women workers were employed in checking as compared to men workers. Those jobs that employed large proportion of women were tailoring (singer), Trimmer and checking. Perception above the work, most of the women workers said that they found their work interesting and few found it monotonous. The men found their work interesting and tailor –workers found it monotonous. Hence, most of the workers try to move to cutting master or tailor- singer, tailor – flat lock and tailor – over lock. Some of the prerequisites for any kind of upward mobility were hard work and experience, along with the ability to maintain good relations with officials and workers. The other form of mobility that was available to the workers seemed to be shift one firm to another.

**Estimation of Occupational Mobility**

Modeling the occupational mobility employed by the probability of responding to the explanatory variables and this has led to the *Logistic regression* model:

***Logit model: In [m/(1-m)] = α + β1A +β2 W + β3K + e***

Where ‘m’ is the expected value of the response variable, *‘occupational mobility’* which in this model is coded as 1 for the mobile and 0 for the not mobile. α and β are the parameters to be estimated. ‘A’ relates to the human capital variables, W denotes workers background variables and K refers industry as well as job specific. The logit regression coefficients can be estimated using the method of maximum likelihood.

Determinants of occupational mobility are examined using three sets of variables as explained below:

‘A’ is a vector of variable like Age, Gender, Education and Technical Training.

‘W’ is vector of the background variables of individual workers such as Area where the worker was born, Caste, Religion, Father’s Education, Father’s Occupational Mobility and Trade Union Membership.

‘K’ is a vector of industry specific and job-related characteristics such as type of industry (small, medium and large) and whether it comes under Labour Law.

α and β are the parameter estimates. Separate Earning functions were estimated for each category. The logistic regression model can be written as:

*In [m/(1-m)]=*α + β1INCOM+ β2AGE + β3AGESQ + β4GEN + β5EDUI + β6EDUA + β7 TECH + β8RURAL + β9RELI + β10BC+ β11MBC + β12SCST + β13MRSTS + β14FAEDU + β15FOCC + β16MOEDU + β17MTUP + β18LAPRJ + β19NAJ + β20ITS+ β21ITML + µ

**Determinants of Occupational Mobility of All Migrant Workers**

Table.11 presents the logit estimate of the occupational mobility of all migrant workers of the garment industry in Tirupur.

**Table.11.Determinants of Occupational Mobility of Migrant Workers**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **β** | **Std.Error** | **Wald** | **Sig.** | **Exp(β)** |
| **Dependent Variable: Occupational Mobility** | | | | | |
| **Human Capital Variable** | | | | | |
| Age in Years | -.428 | .008 | .629 | .006**\*\*\*** | .994 |
| Age Square | .167 | .002 | 1.911 | .002**\*\*\*** | 1.002 |
| Income | .000 | .000 | 6.648 | .010**\*\*** | 1.000 |
| Gender-Male=1,else 0 | -.302 | .150 | 4.031 | .045**\*\*** | .740 |
| Education Illiterate=0,else 0 | .810 | .592 | 1.873 | .171 | 2.247 |
| Education Primary=1, else 0 | .217 | .539 | .163 | .687 | 1.243 |
| Education Secondary=1, else 0 | .413 | .541 | .583 | .445 | 1.511 |
| Education Higher Secondary=1, else 0 | -.384 | .587 | .429 | .512 | .681 |
| Education Diploma and Degree Education =1, else 0 | .771 | .658 | 1.372 | .242 | 2.161 |
| Training=1,else 0 | -1.012 | .655 | 2.385 | .122 | .364 |
| **Workers Background Variable** | | | | | |
| Region Rural=1,else 0 | -.255 | .207 | 1.518 | .218 | .775 |
| Religion Hindu=1,else 0 | 1.609 | .289 | 30.989 | .000**\*\*\*** | 4.996 |
| Religion Christian=1, else 0 | 1.267 | .356 | 12.663 | .000**\*\*\*** | 3.549 |
| Forward Caste=1,else 0 | 1.684 | .695 | 5.872 | .015**\*\*** | 5.387 |
| Backward Caste=1,else 0 | -.086 | .204 | .176 | .675 | .918 |
| Most Backward Caste=1, else 0 | -.167 | .223 | .563 | .453 | .846 |
| Marital Status-Married=1,else 0 | .029 | .172 | .029 | .864 | 1.030 |
| Fathers Education-Illiterate=1, else 0 | -.357 | .148 | 5.831 | .016**\*\*** | .700 |
| Father’s Occupation-Textile=1, else 0 | -.180 | .160 | 1.260 | .262 | .836 |
| Mother’s Education-Illiterate=1, else 0 | .109 | .137 | .633 | .426 | 1.115 |
| Trade Union Membership-Member=1,else 0 | .466 | .316 | 2.165 | .141 | 1.593 |
| **Industry, Job Specific Variable** | | | | | |
| Labour Law-Labour applied=1, else 0 | -.031 | .134 | .052 | .819 | .970 |
| Nature Job-Casual=1, else 0 | -.130 | .475 | .509 | .010**\*\*** | .878 |
| Type of Industry-Small=1, else 0 | .543 | .346 | 2.454 | .117 | 1.721 |
| Type of Industry-Medium/ Large =1, else 0 | .579 | .135 | 18.435 | .000**\*\*\*** | 1.784 |
| **Constant** | -1.430 | .749 | 3.649 | .056**\*\*** | .239 |

\*\*\*P<0.01; \*\*P<.05; \*P<.10 Chi-square - 110.811 df - 26 -2LogLikelihood - 1564.231

Cox & Snell R2 - 0.082 Nagelkerke R2 - 0.113 Sample Size - 1289

**Result and Analysis**

* The result of the logit estimate indicate that the variable Age has negative influence on occupational mobility and significance at one percent level. This result shows that workers occupational mobility decreases when their age increases.
* The variables age square and income have positive significance at five percent level. It is clear that the main motive behind the workers to move from one job to another was to earn more.
* The Gender variable (male) has significantly influence the occupational mobility of all migrant workers in garment industry in Tirupur.
* Education is positive but not significant, but training variables has negative influence on workers’ occupational mobility of all garment workers. It reveals that those who trained in particular organisastion, they are not ready to move to other job and they become familiar in particular work.
* Within the workers’ background variable, region does not have any influence on occupational mobility of all migrant workers in garment industry in Tirupur.
* The workers from Hindu religion have high occupational mobility compared to other religion workers. Forward caste has positive influence on occupational mobility at five percent level significance. Backward caste, Most backward caste and SC/ST have not shown any significant result on occupational mobility of migrant workers.
* Father’s education is negatively significance on occupational mobility at five percent level. Married migrant workers have not been influenced.
* Father’s occupation, mother’s education and trade union are not significant on occupational mobility of workers.
* Labour law has not shown any significant influence on occupational mobility of garment industry workers.
* Casual workers from garment industry have positive impact on occupational mobility and significance at five percent level. The medium/large scale units have positive influence on occupational mobility and highly significant at one percent level.
* Workers in Large/medium scale units have higher occupational mobility than workers in small scale units.
* The percentage of workers who changed their job in the fabrication unit was higher than the other processing units with respect to finishing, embroidery compacting unit workers.

**Comparative Analysis**

* According to the results of the logit estimate, the variable income was positively associated with occupational mobility and significant at one percent level among the male migrant workers category and in other units like knitting, Dying, compacting and Embroidery except Finishing units.
* The variable ‘Age’ has negatively influence the occupational mobility of finishing units workers and male workers category and significance at one percent level; but it was positive sign and significance at five percent level for female category. This result indicates that the higher age group from female category have high occupational mobility.
* Age square has positive influence on job mobility and significance at five percent level in other units whereas one percent level in female workers.
* Gender (male) has negative influenced on occupational mobility in other unit’s workers in garment industry explored the same result of skilled female migrant workers have high occupational mobility).
* Education variables do not influence significantly at all levels supported with similar findings of education was not related to women’s employment pattern).
* Training also has not influence of migrant workers’ job mobility. From the above result, age, income, and age square have positively influenced the occupational mobility of migrant workers than education and training
* The workers from Most backward caste of finishing units have negative influence and significant at ten percent level, which implies that workers from Backward Caste and SC/ST category have higher mobility. In garment industry, marriage does not have any influence on occupational mobility of all migrant workers. It reveals that married workers are not moving to other job, due to family responsibility. Father’s occupation and mother’s education does not have any influence on occupational mobility of migrant workers.
* Membership in trade union has negative impact on job mobility of other units and male workers category, which implies that trade union have an influence on migrant workers’ job mobility in garment industry.
* Type of industry (medium/large) has positive influence on job mobility among finishing units workers with five percent level significant and one percent level of significance for male category and other units’ workers category.
* And also ten percent significant level was recorded for female workers category. This result shows that workers from medium/large scale units have high occupational mobility compared with small scale units workers.

**Suggestion**

1. Migrants are more concentrated in jobs which offer fewer possibilities of promotion. So that gap between migrants and non-migrants should be avoided.
2. The impact of educational qualification on migrant workers is lower than non-migrant workers. Age has more contribution than level of education.
3. Interests of the migrant workers have to be guaranteed by the employer, because the mobility of migrant workers reflects in their aspirations to find better incomes and working conditions.
4. The company has to be followed fair recruitment policy according to law.

**Conclusion**

Migrant workers in the labour market reveal that migrants are more often unemployed in comparison to non-migrants. Moreover, they also have fewer chances to benefit from promotion than non-migrant workers, in addition to facing more often the risk of downward occupational mobility. Formulation of effective employment policies can be improved employability skills and also promote the quality of life of migrant workers and reduce social inequality. It would thus promote optimal labour productivity growth and economy wide competitiveness. This policy will raise the minimum wage tends to reduce the negative effects of occupational mobility between workers in jobs of lower socio-employment status and the lowest paid.
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