

Personal Characteristics of Bihari Migrants: Some Impressions

Received: 01 November 2021

Accepted: 01 December 2021

* Jyoti Verma

Abstract

This paper is part of a major project on 'Bihari migrants in Mumbai' whose sample comprised 152 male Bihari migrants and 155 local people of Mumbai. The paper's observations are based on the migrants' 'self-ratings' of 36 personal attributes associated with the Bihari people and, the ratings of these attributes by the local people of Mumbai. The rating scores were factor analysed for studying the factors of the migrants' 'self-perception,' local people's 'perception,' and the common factors of the migrants' overall personal characteristics extracted through a combined sample score. The results showed that the migrants mainly 'self-categorized' themselves significantly highly on positive attributes, while the local people on the negative ones. Despite whose ratings were used, the factor analysis results suggested two prominent strands in the Bihari people's overall image. One was positive and seemingly represented the core feature of the Bihari people. It described the migrants as, simple, modest and sensitive towards others' feelings. The other aspect was negative and described the migrants as law breakers and quarrelsome in case of the migrant's own self-perception, dishonest and law breakers according to the combined sample factor and law breakers and untrustworthy as regards to the Marathi people's perception. Some anomalies were also observed in the configuration of the factors extracted from the rating scores of different instances (i.e., migrants' self-ratings, local people's perception-based ratings, and the combined sample scores).

Keywords: Bihari migrants, Bihari people, Migrants, Migration destination Mumbai, Self-perception, Inter-group perception

The Backdrop of the Present Study

The present paper is taken out from a major Indian Council of Social Sciences Research (ICSSR) sponsored project (2008-2010, Submitted to ICSSR in December, 2011) on 'Bihari migrants in Mumbai.' The project was an empirical investigation pursued with the help of both qualitative and quantitative methods having three major objectives.

1. Understanding the socially constructed image of the Bihari migrants by the local people of Mumbai.
2. Addressing the basic 'collective identity' issues of the Bihari migrants.
3. Examining the reasons behind the deteriorating relationship between the Bihari migrants and the local people of Mumbai.

The Contextual Frame for the Present Paper

The shared basis of 'self-categorization' (or self-perception) made by a regional group on certain personal attributes that are associated with the people of that region (in this case migrants from Bihar), offers ground for identifying those people as members of a separate collective group. In that sense, this paper touches upon the 'collective identity' issue of the Bihari migrants partially. It is contended that the relationship

between the migrants arriving from an economically disadvantaged state of India, and the local people of an economically viable metropolitan, is likely to be determined by the impression that the migrants leave on the local people, or the way the receiving city's people identify the migrants on the basis of their prominent characteristics. Therefore, it was interesting to examine the configurations of the 'empirically derived factors' based on the Bihari migrants' self-ratings on certain personal characteristics and also, the factors extracted from the local people's ratings of the attributes associated with this regional group. Additionally, it made sense to look for the common factors extracted from the combined sample rating scores for getting a clue to the collective identity of that regional group.

The main project had another interest too, namely, in the formation of 'collective identity' inspired by the concept of social identity. For that part, the researcher looked for some shared activities and common experiences of the migrants that were likely to facilitate the 'formation of a collective,' the apparent 'indicators' of collective identity, and the special 'feelings' rooted in the migrants' new found collective identity. However, this second perspective is not being touched upon here.

*Former University Professor of Psychology, Patna University, Patna, Bihar, India.

Introduction

Bihar is known for the phenomenon of outmigration. According to the Census of India, 2011 (Tables D2 and D3), 74,53,803 persons out-migrated from the state of Bihar. Referring to the same source, Sarkar (2019) observes that between 1951 and 1961, about 4 percent of Bihar's population migrated which became 2 percent between the years 1971 and 1981. However, in 1981, the total number of migrants almost doubled to 2.5 million (Sharma, 1997). In late nineties, the migrants from Uttar Pradesh and Bihar kept migrating in large proportion vis-à-vis the non-migrants and migrants from within the state of Maharashtra (Singh, 2005). Apparently, during the inter-censal period between 2001 and 2011, around 9.3 million Bihari people had migrated (Census of India, 2011).

As the projects' data was collected in Mumbai, it needs mentioning that migration has played a major role in the economic and social transformation of Mumbai and in changing its demographic profile. During the initial independence years (1951-61), migrants constituted about 50 per cent of the total growth of the population of the metropolitan which remained high (Singh, 2007). Reporting the migration trend in Mumbai in fifty years, Singh (2007) informs that after the highest (37.4%) percentage of migrants born within the state of Maharashtra, followed by the migrant groups from Uttar Pradesh (24.3%) and Gujarat (9.6%), the percentage for the Bihari migrants remained within 4 percent. According to one estimate, there are around 2.5 million Bihari migrants working in Mumbai, and nearly half that number in other cities of Maharashtra (Malekar, 2008). Referring to the Census of India, 2011 (Table D2), 5,68,667 persons migrated from Bihar to Maharashtra. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to find the exact number of Bihari migrants in Mumbai in the records of the Government of Bihar or any update in this context.

It has been reported that migrants who have lived in Mumbai for long, are seen dominating pharmaceuticals sectors, security services, real estate and dairy in various capacities. However, in the early 1980s, more migrants were found in production related occupations like industrial and manufacturing sectors in comparison to the non-migrants seen more in professional, technical, administrative and clerical occupations in Mumbai. On the other hand, in the wholesale, community social services and construction sectors, the migrants and the non-migrants were represented equally (Singh, 2005). Bihari migrant are heavily concentrated in the districts

that offer lively economic hubs with industries and in Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise sectors (Sarkar, 2019).

As labourers, Bihari migrants toil hard building bridges, flyovers, dams, and shopping malls in different states of India. Additionally, they also work as security guards, rickshaw pullers and coolies, etc. (Sharma, 2005). It appears that over the last two decades the occupational pattern for both migrants and non-migrants has remained largely the same (Singh, 2005). Living invariably in modest to very poor living conditions, the Bihari migrants often face threat from local political parties and sometimes by the local people. Deshingkar and Atker (2009) and Deshingkar et al. (2006) are important references for all the important concerns related to the migrants.

Method

Sample (The Bihari Migrants): The sample comprised 152 Bihari migrants apparently compelled to leave their homes due to lesser job opportunities and poverty back at their native place. Seventy eight percent of them were married and their average age was around 33.09 years (S.D. = 11). The migrants were not well educated as 75.7 % of them have had only some school level education, while 24.3 % of them had not been to school. Among the educated, the highest percentage was that of the Secondary School Certificate holders (i.e., 23.7%). Further, 18.4% had studied up to Middle school level, 13.2%, up to High School level, and 11.8% up to the Primary School level. The exceptions were 13 out of the 152 migrants who were Graduates (11) or Post Graduates (2). The migrants came from the 27 districts from all over Bihar and were often helped by their Mumbai based relatives, fellow villagers and acquaintances in reaching Mumbai.

Earning money was the foremost reason behind the poor villagers to migrate and their average monthly income was close to Rs. 6,600. In this regard, the least that a migrant could earn was about Rupees 2,500 in a month. However, on the higher side, the monthly income of a few could reach anywhere between Rs. 15,000 to Rs. 20,000. The most frequently endorsed monthly earning slots were Rs. 4,000 to Rs. 6,000, Rs. 6,000 to Rs 8,000 and Rs. 8,000 to Rs. 10,000 respectively. However, barring a few exceptions, the annual household income of the majority of the migrants was between Rs. 51,000 to Rs. 75,000

More than 50% of the migrants of the sample were working as menial laborers followed by another 27% who were auto rickshaw and taxi drivers. Furthermore,

12/ Personal Characteristics of Bihari Migrants: Some Impressions

6% to 3% of the migrants were engaged in multifarious jobs like shop keeping, clerical job or skilled occupations.

Occupation wise income distribution suggested that on the average, a wage earners income was less than Rs. 6,000 per month, while the auto and taxi drivers could earn a little more but their earnings varied much. Migrants who could get clerical and skill-based jobs managed to earn something between Rs. 7,000 to Rs. 8,000 in a month. It appeared that the present sample of the Bihari migrants was the closest case of interstate migration to large urban centers for casual laboring in the non-farm sectors.

The remittance money sent home, amounted to anything between Rs. 1,000 to Rs 4,000 and was mainly utilized for food, medical facilities, children's education, paying loans, children's marriage, farming, repairing or constructing a house. In Mumbai however, the migrants lived in modest conditions of slums and chawls and without their families.

Sample of the Local People of Mumbai: The sample comprised 155 local Marathi speaking respondents whose average age was 33.18 years (S.D.= 12.06 years). The Mumbai respondents were better educated and none of them was illiterate. The group comprised of Graduates and Post Graduates (18.7% and 13.5% respectively) with only 6.5 to 7% of the people having education up till Primary level or less. Notably, out of the 155, 25.2% were educated up to the Secondary School Certificate (SSC) level and though, 29% did not have the degree, but were educated close to that level.

Majority (99.3%) of the local people lived in flats, chawls and slums. It appeared that the local respondents came from at least 26 localities of Mumbai. The maximum number of them came from Chembur (24), Pinjarpol (21), Ghatkopar (17) and Vashi Nagar (16). Others in declining numbers came from Deonar (8), Govandi (7), Tilak Nagar (5), Mulund (4), Parel, Sion, Guru, T.B. Marg (3 in each case), Kunjur Marg, Arohi, Kurla, Vadala, and Komathe (2 from each place). Only 1 respondent each, came from the following 10 localities: Powai, Shival, Mankhurd, Santacruz, Dadar, UlhasNagar, Vikroli, Khar, Gaikvad and Chuuna Bhatti.

The Mumbai people's occupations included: Private service (23.3%), Government service (10.53%), B.M.C. workers (9.87%), social workers and NGOs (7.24%), labors (7.24%), businessman (6.58%), drivers (5.26%), guards (5.26%), singer (.66%) and research associates (.66%). The sample also had 12.5% of stu-

dents, 5.92% of unemployed and 5.26% of retired people. Notably, with 35 non-earning students in the sample, the information on the monthly earning slots was based on the 120 valid cases only. In nut shell,

though the monthly average income of a local person appeared a little less than 10,000 Rupees, the range for the extreme cases was fairly wide (i.e., between Rs. 1,500 a month to Rs. 70,000 per month). A large S.D. was self-explanatory in this case.

Purpose of the Present Paper

1. Investigating how the Bihari migrants' 'self-categorized' or rated themselves on some positive and negative 'personal qualities' associated with the Bihari people. Additionally, examining the local people's 'perception' (or evaluation) of the migrants on the same personal attributes.

2. Comparing the ratings of the Bihari migrants' 'self-perception' and the local people's 'perception' of the migrant group.

3. Extracting factors based on the migrants' self-ratings scores for understanding the aspects of their 'self-perception.'

4. Extracting factors from the local people's ratings of the Bihari migrants' personal attributes and studying the dimensions of their 'perception' of the migrant group.

5. Studying the configuration of the combined sample factors extracted through the combined rating scores of the two groups, and probing the significant differences between the factors' Mean scores.

Measures

The List of Personal Attributes of the Bihari Migrants- Thirty-six negative and positive personal characteristics of the Bihari people were developed by a group of senior psychologists of Bihar with research and university teaching experience. The respondents were asked to rate the items of the list on 5 points scale according to the following instructions: "Given below is a list of good and bad qualities and certain things about the nature of the Bihari people. We request you to go through each of them carefully and tell us as to what extent they 'correctly' or 'incorrectly' feature the Bihari people. If you think that a particular attribute is 'Totally correct' for the Biharis, then choose to say 5, if 'Correct,' then choose to say 4, if you 'Cannot decide,' than say 3, if you consider it to be 'Wrong' then say 2 and if you think it is 'Totally wrong' then choose 1." The personal characteristics included in the list were:

1. Simple 2. Modest, Polite 3. Are greedy 4. Respect others' feelings 5. Low in self esteem 6. Do not follow law & rules 7. Say something do something else 8. Want to become rich anyhow 9. Understand others' pain and pleasure 10. Are tolerant 11. Are dishonest 12. Are reliable /trustworthy 13. Blame others for their mistakes 14. Do not work without pressure 15. Spill dirt in public places Do not care for their looks and clothes 16. Help people from their own village, district 17. Work together in harmony	18. Do parvi 19. Bribe for getting work done 20. Harm others' work 21. Are lazy 22. Are cunning 23. Are cheaters/fraud 24. Are fearless 25. Are of criminal nature 26. Are loud mouth 27. Are cowards 28. Are courageous 29. Are sweet talkers 30. Are rustic/ <i>ganwar</i> 31. Are quarrelsome 32. Are <i>jugadi</i> 33. Are helpful to all 34. Are selfish 35. Are contended
---	--

Procedure: A senior professor from the Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS), Mumbai, was requested to coordinate in the study. This colleague helped the author, also the Project Director, in hiring trained research assistants and later in the analysis of the quantitative results. The research assistants approached the prospective respondents for data collection from different localities of Mumbai after taking an appointment. Another practice was to reach particular vicinity where people gathered at their free time and look for respondents who agreed to cooperate in data collection. Often the new respondents were contacted with the help of those who had already helped in data collection. Data collection was not easy, the author Project Director had to depend on the help from TISS as she was located in Patna and could not have shifted to Mumbai for the entire long period of data collection due to logistical constraints. Nevertheless, she travelled and stayed in Mumbai as much as feasible and monitored the procedure.

The personal attribute of the list was verbally mentioned in Hindi and the meaning of the 5 scale points was explained. The research assistants were available throughout the data collection period and in case the migrants needed help in responding, the chosen rating scores were noted down for them. Similarly, the local

people were requested to rate the migrants on the list of attributes with the help of the scale points. However, they were asked to tell whether the given characteristics were 'correct' or 'incorrect' for the migrants according to their perception.

Analysis

The analysis included computing Mean and standard deviation for the rating scores given against the personal attributes by the respective groups. Furthermore, t test was applied for examining the Mean differences between the ratings of the two groups. The analysis also included factor analyzing the rating scores of both the groups separately for understanding the configuration of the extracted dimensions of self-perception of the Bihari migrants in one case, and the Marathi respondents' perception of the Bihari migrants on the other. Factor analysis was done by the Principle Axis method and rotated by the Varimax till the Eigen value reached 1 or more than 1. At this instance, items that loaded .35 or more on a particular factor were considered to be part of that factor. Finally, the combined rating scores of the two groups were factor analyzed with the purpose of arriving at the common dimensions of the personal characteristics of the Bihari migrants and getting an idea of their overall character.

14/ Personal Characteristics of Bihari Migrants: Some Impressions

Results

Table 1: Ratings of the Personal Attributes of the Bihari Migrants and the t Test

Personal Attributes	State	t	Mean	S.D	Sig.
Simple	Bihari	8.07	3.72	0.99	0.00
	Maharastrian		2.53	1.53	
Modest , Polite	Bihari	5.75	3.18	0.95	0.00
	Maharastrian		2.37	1.46	
Are greedy	Bihari	-12.19	2.19	1.23	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.87	1.19	
Care for others' feelings	Bihari	5.90	3.29	1.14	0.00
	Maharastrian		2.39	1.51	
Low self esteem	Bihari	3.91	2.55	1.01	0.00
	Maharastrian		2.01	1.40	
Do not obey law	Bihari	-5.62	2.66	1.10	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.46	1.37	
Say something do something	Bihari	-4.13	2.86	1.39	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.52	1.42	
Want to become rich	Bihari	-4.77	3.39	1.20	0.00
	Maharastrian		4.03	1.14	
Understand other's pain	Bihari	5.71	3.36	0.94	0.00
	Maharastrian		2.53	1.52	
Are tolerant	Bihari	2.41	3.25	1.00	0.02
	Maharastrian		2.89	1.55	
Are dishonest	Bihari	-6.23	2.59	0.94	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.42	1.35	
Trustworthy	Bihari	6.49	3.03	0.88	0.00
	Maharastrian		2.18	1.37	
Blame others	Bihari	-3.20	2.87	1.16	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.34	1.42	
Do not work without pressure	Bihari	-3.93	2.75	1.09	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.34	1.51	
Mess up public places	Bihari	-5.15	2.85	2.77	0.00
	Maharastrian		4.09	1.14	
Do not care about their clothes	Bihari	-13.63	2.47	1.10	0.00
	Maharastrian		4.08	0.96	
Help their own caste people	Bihari	-11.32	3.18	1.15	0.00
	Maharastrian		4.50	0.87	
Work collectively	Bihari	1.47	3.47	1.07	0.14 n.s.
	Maharastrian		3.24	1.60	
Do pairvi	Bihari	3.17	2.97	1.03	0.00
	Maharastrian		2.52	1.39	
Bribe for work	Bihari	-6.15	2.72	1.09	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.57	1.32	
Harm other's work	Bihari	-6.14	2.51	1.11	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.43	1.48	
Are lazy	Bihari	5.42	2.58	1.15	0.00
	Maharastrian		1.80	1.37	
Are cunning	Bihari	-4.90	3.14	1.18	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.76	1.04	
Are fraud	Bihari	-5.97	2.66	1.09	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.52	1.41	

Cont...

Personal Characteristics of Bihari Migrants: Some Impressions /15

Personal Attributes	State	t	Mean	S.D	Sig.
Are unafraid	Bihari	-2.31	3.09	1.07	0.02
	Maharastrian		3.43	1.43	
Are of criminal nature	Bihari	-2.20	2.52	1.20	0.03
	Maharastrian		2.88	1.66	
Are loud mouth	Bihari	-6.15	2.61	1.16	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.52	1.40	
Are timid and afraid	Bihari	5.90	2.97	1.21	0.00
	Maharastrian		2.06	1.46	
Are courageous	Bihari	0.02	3.48	0.88	0.98n.s.
	Maharastrian		3.48	1.32	
Are sweet talkers	Bihari	-8.70	3.25	1.02	0.00
	Maharastrian		4.14	0.75	
Are rustic	Bihari	-7.21	2.68	1.06	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.69	1.37	
Are quarrelsome	Bihari	-5.24	2.72	1.08	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.50	1.51	
Are jugadi	Bihari	-4.63	2.99	1.09	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.63	1.31	
Helpful	Bihari	9.03	3.47	0.89	0.00
	Maharastrian		2.21	1.47	
Selfish	Bihari	-7.40	2.83	0.99	0.00
	Maharastrian		3.76	1.16	
Satisfied people	Bihari	2.60	3.02	1.21	0.01
	Maharastrian		2.60	1.53	

It appeared that the migrants self-rated themselves significantly highly than the Mumbai people on certain positive attributes that presented them *as simple, modest, respectful towards others feelings, people who understood others' pain and pleasure, tolerant, trustworthy, helpful, and satisfied people*. At the same time, they self-categorized themselves significantly highly on the negative attributes like, *lazy, low on self-esteem, timid and people who do pairvi for work to be done too*.

Looking at the observations from the Marathi peoples' perspective, the Bihari migrants were perceived as significantly more *greedy and dishonest people, who did not obey law, said something did something else, wanted to become rich anyhow, those who blamed others for their own fault, didn't work without pressure, messed up public places, didn't care about their dress, bribed for work to be done, harmed others' work, helped people from their own community, were cunning, fraud, rustic, quarrelsome, jugadi, and selfish people*. Nevertheless, the local people considered the migrants to be *unafraid and sweet talkers*.

It may be briefly mentioned that the negative impressions about the migrants had emerged prominently in the qualitative data (not being dealt in this paper but shall be referred sparsely for an overall impression). In their qualitative deliberations, the local people had described Bihari people as *involved in anti-social activities, clever, selfish, dirty and people who have nothing good about them*. However, one occasionally noticed contradictions, depending on the method of data collection. For instance, responses against one of the open-ended questions described Bihari people as *hard working*, but the migrants' self-categorized themselves as *lazy*. Similarly, the local people held the 'opinion,' that Biharis were 'dominant' people, whereas, the migrants self-rated themselves as *timid and afraid*.

Talking of the difference between the ratings of the two groups, it was quite obvious that Biharis were rated negatively by the local people and the only time that they did not differ with the migrants' self-perception was when they rated Biharis as 'courageous' and people who 'worked collectively.' Apparently, the *t* results supported the qualitative observations that the migrants

16/ Personal Characteristics of Bihari Migrants: Some Impressions

were generally perceived in a negative light by the present sample of the local people of Mumbai.

The Factor Analysis Results

A major concern of the study was to understand the shared basis of self-categorization of the Bihari migrants and getting an idea of the dimensions of their self-image as a regional group or collective. For this purpose, the migrants' self-rating scores were factor

analyzed. Factor Analysis helped extract 12 factors including two high loading single items. However, three of the factors were not considered for further analysis due to their low reliability coefficients. Table 2. contains the migrants' self-perception factors, their names, Mean scores, standard deviations, variance explained and the reliability coefficients. The description of the factors is presented in the end of table 2.

Table 2: Factor Name, Mean, Standard Deviation, Variance Explained and Reliability Coefficients for the Bihari Migrants' Self Perception Factors

Factor 1

Modest and sensitive towards others' feelings

Mean=3.37(.62), Variance explained 9.13%, $r = .66$

Item no.	Items	Loadings
1	Simple	.75
2	Modest polite	.68
4	Respect others' feelings	.65
29	Courageous	.56
34	Are helpful	.50
17	Help people of their own community	.47
9	Understand others' pain and pleasure	.37

Factor. 2

Law violators and quarrelsome

Mean=3.32 (.79), Variance explained: 7.21%, $r = .58$

6	Do not follow rules	.73
32	Are quarrelsome	.69
24	Are frauds	.57

Factor 3

Unreliable and unsure about self

Mean=3.19(.80), Variance explained: 6.38%, $r = .61$

7	Say something do something else	.82
5	Have low self esteem	.60
13	Blame others for their fault	.52
1.	Do pairvi	.38
8	Want to become rich any how	.34

Factor 4

Confirmatory

Mean=3.50(.82), Variance explained: 5.98%, $r = .61$

16	Don't care for their dress	.79
21	Harm others work	.55
18	Work collectively	.53

Factor 5

Timid and rustic

Mean=3.20(.85), Variance explained: 5.69%, $r = .66$

28	Are timid and afraid	.77
30	Are sweet talkers	-.70
31	Are rustic 'ganwar'	.49

Factor 6

Loud and lazy

Mean= 3.38 (.81), Variance explained: 5.25%, $r = .53$

27	Loud mouth	.73
23	Clever	.59
22	Are lazy	.39

Factor 7

Practical

Mean=3.34(.83), Variance explained: 4.98 %, $r = .49$

20	Give bribe for work to be done	.79
11	Dishonest	.51

Factor 8

Trustworthy

Mean = 3.03 (.88), Variance explained : 4.38%

12	Trustworthy	.87
----	-------------	-----

Factor 9

Low civic sense

Mean = 3.75 (2.77), Variance explained : 3.75%

15	Dirty public places	.74
----	---------------------	-----

Factor 1: Modest, and Sensitive towards Others' Feelings

The highest percentage (9.13%) of total variance explaining factor with 7 highly loading items, was named, 'Modest and Sensitive towards Others' Feelings.' The factor configured out of attributes like: simple (loading .75), modest (loading .68), respect others' feelings (loading .65), courageous (loading .56), helpful (loading .50), help people of their own community (loading .47) and understand others' pain and pleasure (loading .37). The factor gave the impression that Biharis perceived themselves as simple and modest people who cared for others' feelings, tried to be helpful and particularly helpful to the people of their own community.

Understandably, the naïve villagers who arrived in Mumbai looking for livelihood, must often depend on the support and empathy of the people from their own region for surviving and settling down in an unfamiliar big city. This becomes possible if Biharis as a collective remained sensitive towards the feelings and needs of each other. The factor made sense also because Biharis care for social relationships. The factor had a fairly large Mean score (3.37) and a small standard deviation (.63) suggesting little variability in the ratings of the respondents. The factor's Chronbach's Alpha score was .66.

Factor 2: Law Violators and Quarrelsome

The second factor named, 'Law Violators and Quarrelsome' explained 7.12% of the common variance and had only 3 high loading items. This dimension of the Bihari people's self-perception did not seem to complement the earlier one namely, 'Modest, and Sensitive towards Others' Feelings.' Perhaps, the factor hinted towards the proclivities for 'wrong doing' aspect of the Bihari migrants' self-image probably envisioned handy for surviving in an adverse, hardly sympathetic and unfamiliar environment. The factor described Biharis as people who did not obey rules and law (loading .73), were quarrelsome (loading .69) and even fraud (loading .57). The Mean score for the factor was 3.32 and the standard deviation .79. The factor did not show a very high reliability coefficient (Chronbach's Alpha = .58) but was retained due to its configuration.

Factor 3: Unreliable and Unsure about their Self

With 5 items, the third factor presented migrants as 'Unreliable and Unsure about their Self.' The constituent attributes of the factor were, say something do something else (loading .82), have low self-esteem (loading .60) and blame others for their fault (loading .52). The remaining two items, seemed to support the factor's

configuration by featuring Biharis as people who involved themselves in doing pairvi for work to be done (loading .38) and wanting to become rich any how (loading .34). Seemingly, both the items were indirect indicators of being 'Unsure about Oneself.' The first feature i.e., doing pairvi for work to be done suggested a general lack of self-confidence while the second (want to become rich anyhow), lack of trust in one's capabilities to acquire money. On the whole, the factor seemed to give an impression that Biharis saw themselves as 'unreliable' for others, and 'unsure about themselves.' This factor explained 6.38% of the common variance, had a Mean score of 3.19 and a standard deviation of .80. The factor had modest reliability (Chronbach's Alpha = .61).

Factor 4: Confirmatory

Factor 4 was named 'Confirmatory' with two negative loading items and one positive. The factor suggested that Bihari people saw an aspect of 'conformist' in their personal character. Accordingly, the highest loading items were, don't care for their dress (loading -.79), harm others work (loading -.55) and work collectively (loading .53). The cluster of items in this case, seemed to submit that Bihari migrants cared about how they dressed up, did not like to harm others' work, and worked collectively indicating their preference for 'confirmatory' behavior. The factor had the highest Mean score (3.50) among all the factors and a standard deviation value of .82. The reliability coefficient for the factor was moderate (Chronbach's Alpha = .61) and the factor explained 5.98% of the common variance.

Factor 5: Timid and Rustic

Factor 5 named 'Timid and Rustic,' pronounced Biharis as timid and afraid (loading = .77), not sweet talkers (-.70) and rustic (.49). The self-description made sense when examined in the background that the migrants were village based, rustic people from a poor state who were not particularly welcome at their migration destination. Apparently, timid and afraid people in the new environment, perhaps cannot remain sweet talkers forever in all the situations. The factor explained 5.69% of the common variance and had a reasonably acceptable reliability coefficient (Chronbach's Alpha = .66). The Mean score and the standard deviation for the factor were 3.20 and .85 respectively.

Factor 6: Loud and Lazy

The sixth factor was labeled 'Loud and Lazy' and explained 5.25% of the common variance. The constituting items of the factor described Bihari migrants as

18/ Personal Characteristics of Bihari Migrants: Some Impressions

loud mouth (loading .73), clever (loading.59), and lazy (loading.51). The factor did not seem to present a meaningful configuration initially, but perhaps was a pointer towards a façade suggesting the migrants were loud mouth and clever on the one hand, but lazy on the other. The Mean score of the factor was fairly high (3.38) and the standard deviation for the factor was .81. The reliability index of the factor was not very high (Cronbach's Alpha =.53).

Factor7: Practical

Factor 7 was named 'Practical.' The two highly loading items of the factors were, give bribe for work to be done (loading .79) and dishonest (loading.51). The configuration made some sense as some would say that these are the features of a 'practical' person. The factor was retained despite its modest reliability coefficient (i.e., Chronbach's Alpha) of .49. The Mean score of the factor was fairly high (3.34) and it had a standard deviation of .83. The factor explained 4.98% of the common variance.

Factor 8: Trustworthy

Factors 8 was a single item high loading factor which read 'Trustworthy' (loading .87). The Mean score and standard deviation for the factor were 3.03 and .88 respectively. The factor explained 4.38% of the common variance.

Factor 9: Low Civic Sense

Factors 9too was a single item factor which read dirty public places (loading .74) and was given the name 'Low Civic sense'. The Mean score for the factor was 3.75 and it showed an unusually high standard deviation (2.77). The factor explained 3.75% of the common variance suggesting that there was much unex-

plained error variance behind the factor.

Self-Perception Profile of the Bihari Migrants

On account of the extracted factors, the foremost aspect of the Bihari migrants' self-categorization suggested that they perceived themselves as 'modest people who were sensitive towards others' feelings.' Moreover, the migrants also saw themselves as 'timid' and 'rustic' people who were 'trustworthy' and believed in 'confirmatory' behavior. However, the other dimension of their self-profile comprised of negative self-description portraying them as 'law violators,' 'quarrelsome people,' 'unreliable' and 'unsure about themselves.' Moreover, the migrants submitted that Bihari people were 'loud and lazy,' showed 'low civic sense' and even had the proclivity for choosing to act 'practically' or 'dishonestly.' In sum, the migrants did not depict themselves in an outright positive manner but their self-assessed image had some very positive qualities like trustworthy and most importantly, being modest and sensitive people who understood others' feelings.

Effort to Understand the Shared Basis of the Migrants' Personal Characteristics: Factors Extracted from the Combined Rating Scores of the Two Groups

Although the researcher had separately extracted factors by using the rating scores of the local people too, for the present paper, it was decided not to go into their detail but refer and discuss the combined sample factors only. However, before doing so. it may still be useful to give a glance to the factor names, Mean, standard deviation, variance explained and reliability coefficients for the factors extracted from the ratings of the Marathi people against the personal attributes of the Bihari people (see Table. 3).

Table 3: Factor Names, Mean, Standard Deviation, Variance Explained and Reliability Coefficients for the Factors of the Marathi People's Perception of the Bihari Migrants

Factor 1

Modest and sensitive towards feelings

Mean=2.51(1.03), Variance explained: 11.96%, $r = .84$

2	Modest	.78
1	Simple people	.75
10	Tolerant	.75
9	Understand other's pain and pleasure	.61
4	Respectful towards others feelings	.50
21	Harm other's work	-.46
34	Helpful	.45
27	Loudmouth	-.46

Factor 2

Clever and practical

Mean=2.48 (.68), Variance explained: 7.16%, $r = .68$

23	Clever	.73
3	Greedy	.62
20	Give bribe for work to be done	.56
33	Manipulative/operative (jugadi)	.47
36	Selfish	.39

Factor 3

Law breakers and unconfident about self

Mean=2.75(.91), Variance explained: 6.32%, $r = .62$

6	Don't follow rules and regulation	.72
5	Low self esteem	.61
7	Say something do something else	.57
8	Want to become rich anyhow	.39

Factor 4

Fearless

Mean=3.33(.76), Variance explained: 6.19%, $r = .65$

25	Are fearless	.74
29	Are courageous	.71
28	Are coward and fearful	-.70

Factor 5

Untrustworthy

Mean=2.42 (.1.07), Variance explained: 5.24%, $r = .68$

12	Trustworthy	-.74
11	Dishonest	.66
24	Fraud and cheaters	.44

Factor 6

Unsophisticated

Mean=2.49 (.1.05), Variance explained: 4.47%, $r = .58$

31	Are rustic	.72
13	Blame others for their fault	.51
32	Quarrelsome	.47

Factor 7

Not contended

Mean = 2.06 (1.53) Variance explained: 3.77%,

36	Santoshi contended people	-.72
----	---------------------------	------

The Combined Sample Factors

Coming to the combined sample factors, it needs mention that the rating scores of both the groups were combined and factor analyzed. The purpose was exploring, (a) whether the factors extracted in this manner, would help clarify the common aspects of Bihari migrants' personal characteristics and (b) whether these factors were comparable with the factors extracted separately by using the rating scores of the two groups. Table 4 contains the factor names, Mean and standard deviation, variance explained and the reliability coefficients for the combined sample factors of the Bihari migrants' personal attributes. The factors are described in the end of table 4.

Table 4:

Factor Names, Mean, Standard Deviation, Variance Explained and Reliability Coefficients for the **Combined Sample Factors** of the Bihari Migrants' **Personal Attributes**

Factor 1

Modest and sensitive towards others' feelings

Mean =2.98 (.89), Variance explained:12.58% $r = .83$

Item no.	Item	Loadings
1	Simple	.73
2	Modest , Polite	.72
4	Care for others feeling	.67
9	Understand other's pain and pleasure	.66
10	Are tolerant	.64
34	Helpful	.56
36	Satisfied people	.52
21	Harm others' work	-.47
18	Work collectively	.44

Factor 2

Dishonest and law breakers

Mean =2.88 (.89), Variance explained: 8.83% $r = .77$

11.	Dishonest	.69
6	Do not obey law	.60
24	Fraud	.60
14	Don't work without pressure	.55
32	Quarrelsome	.52
12	Trustworthy	-.49

Factor 3

Low in dress and civic sense

Mean=2.70 (1.17), Variance explained: 8.04% $r = .50$

16	Do not care about their dress	.77
15	Mess up public places	.65
20	Bribe for work to be done	.51

Factor 4

Want to become rich any how

Mean=2.66 (.90), Variance explained: 6.20% $r = .68$

8	Want to become rich any how	.64
23	Are cunning	.58
3	Greedy	.54
35	Selfish	.43

Factor 5

Jugadi Mean=3.19(.69), Variance explained: $r = .63\%$

33	Jugadi	.75
30	Sweet talkers	.45

Factor 6

Rustic Mean =2.60 (1.22), Variance explained: 3.98%

31	Rustic	.70
----	--------	-----

Note: S.D. reported in parentheses

20/ Personal Characteristics of Bihari Migrants: Some Impressions

Factor 1: Modest, and Sensitive Towards Others' Feelings

The first factor explained the largest percentage of total variance (12.58%) and shared the common name 'Modest and Sensitive towards Others' Feelings,' due to similarity in the constituent items of the respective first factors of the Bihari migrants' 'self-perception,' and the the local people's 'perception.' In other words, the configuration of the first factors of the separately done factor analysis for the two regional groups, appeared again in the combined sample factor.

Getting back to the combined sample factor 1, the 9 high loading items in this case were, *simple* (loading .73), *modest* (loading .72), *respect others' feelings* (loading .67), *understand others' pain and pleasure* (loading .66), *tolerant* (loading .64), *helpful* (loading .56), *satisfied people* (loading .52), *harm others' work* (loading -.47) and *work collectively* (.44). The only item with a negative loading was *harm others' work*, which did not disturb the factor's configuration. Notably, two of the characteristics (i.e., *satisfied people* and *work collectively*) that showed up in the combined sample factor 1, had not appeared earlier for the commonly shared factor1, extracted separately for the two groups. The new items added a couple of positive qualities to this overall positive factor. The Mean score and the standard deviation for the factor were 2.98 and .89 respectively and the factor showed satisfactory reliability coefficient (Chronbach's Alpha = .83).

Factor 2: Dishonest and Law Violators

The second combined sample factor, with 6 high loading items was named 'Dishonest and Law Violators.' The factor explained 8.83% of the common variance and its highest loading item was *dishonest* (loading .69). It may be recalled that factor 2 of the Bihari migrants' self-perception was named 'Law Violators and Quarrelsome' and three of its highly loading items were the same as the ones that loaded on the combined sample factor 2. The other high loading items of the combined sample factor 2, were, *do not obey law* (loading .60), *fraud* (loading .60), *do not work without pressure* (loading .55), *quarrelsome* (loading .52) and *trustworthy* (with negative loading of -.49). The Mean score for the factor was 2.88 and standard deviation .87. The factor showed a fairly high reliability coefficient (Chronbach's Alpha = .77). Apparently, factor 2 of the Bihari migrants' self-

perception and the combined sample factor 2 shared similarities in configuration to an extent.

Factor 3: Low in Dress and Civic Sense

The third combined sample factor was named 'Low in Dress and Civic Sense,' and explained 8.04% of the common variance. The three high loading items on this factor read, *don't care about their dress* (loading .77), *mess up public places* (loading .65) and *bribe for work to be done* (loading .51). The Mean score and the standard deviation for the factor were 2.70 and 1.17 respectively. The factor did not have very high Chronbach's Alpha (.50).

Factor 4: Want to become Rich any How

Factor 4 explained 6.20% of the common variance and was entitled, 'Want to Become Rich Anyhow, the four high loading items on this factor were, *want to become rich any how* (loading .64), *cunning* (loading .58), *greedy* (loading .54) and *selfish* (loading .43). The factor's Mean score and standard deviation were 2.63 and .90 respectively and the factor appeared to be a reliable one (Chronbach's Alpha = .68).

Factor 5: Jugadi (One who can manage)

Factor 5 was named 'Jugadi' as it featured Biharis as people who could manage things anyhow and were therefore, *jugadi*. The first high loading item on this factor was *jugadi* (loading .75), and the second one was *sweet talker* (loading .45). The items seemed to make sense together. The factor had the highest Mean score (i.e., 3.19) and the smallest standard deviation value (i.e., .69) therefore, it appeared to be a more readily endorsed factor with little variability in the responses. The factor explained 4.86 % of the common variance but showed a Chronbach's Alpha with a negative sign of -.63. The alpha reliability value appears negative due to a negative average covariance among items. This violates reliability model assumptions.

Factor 6: Rustic

Labeled as 'Rustic', Factor 6 was a single item factor with the same name (loading = .70). The Mean score for the factor (i.e., 2.81) was accompanied by a large standard deviation (1.32) while the item explained 3.98% of the common variance. Finally, as the interest also lay in discovering the significant differences between the Mean scores of the combined sample factors, the observations in this context are presented in table 5.

Table 5: Significant Difference between the Mean Scores of the Combined Sample Factors

Factor Name	Mean (S.D)	Mean (S.D.)	Mean Difference	<i>T</i>	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Bihari	Marathi				
Factor 1						
Modest and sensitive towards others' feelings	3.35 (.58)	2.59 (.98)	.76	8.10	293	.000
Factor 2						
Dishonest and law breakers	3.28 (.62)	2.49 (.94)	.78	8.58	305	.000
Factor 3						
Low civic sense	3.32 (1.14)	2.09 (.82)	1.23	10.89	305	.000
Factor 4						
Want to become rich any how	3.12 (.75)	2.15 (.77)	.97	10.98	294	.000
Factor 5						
Jugadi	3.13 (.67)	3.25 (.72)	-.12	-1.56	305	.12
Factor 6						
Rustic	3.03 (.88)	2.18 (1.36)	.85	6.49	305	.000

Independent Samples Levene's Test for Equality of Variances *df between*: 294 -305 Table 5 shows that the Mean scores of the combined sample factors differed significantly in case of five out of the six factors. That is, the Bihari migrants had rated themselves significantly more highly on 5 out of the 6 factors irrespective of the factors being positive or negative in character. More specifically, the Bihari migrants self-categorized themselves significantly highly on characteristics that presented them as 'Modest and Sensitive towards Others' Feelings', but also 'Dishonest and Law Breakers,' persons having

'Low Civic Sense', 'Rustic' and those, 'Wanting to Become Rich Any How.' The only personal attribute on which the two groups did not show any significant difference was *Jugadi* (factor 5).

The combined factor1, portrayed the migrants as '*modest, simple, helpful, sensitive towards others' pain and pleasure and people who did not harm others,*' seemed plausible. It has been mentioned that the migrants came to Mumbai with the help and support of other co-villagers, relatives and friends. Moreover, being villagers, they were familiar with the culture of interdependence, sharing and believing in community

22/ Personal Characteristics of Bihari Migrants: Some Impressions

life values. Apparently, the migrants seem to have retained a villager's simplicity and modesty and sensitivity towards others' sufferings and difficulties. However, the high Mean score for the factor 'Dishonest and Law Breakers,' makes one think. One interpretation could be that the migrants knew some other Bihari migrant in Mumbai personally, or otherwise, who were 'law breaker' and 'dishonest.' Perhaps, the other combined factors hinted that the migrants felt attracted towards certain negative tendencies (i.e., '*wanting to become rich any how*') and recognized being *rustic* and having *low civic sense*.

Summary of the Findings

If one looked into the factors in each case that is, Bihari migrants' self-perception, local people's perception of the migrants' personal attributes, and the combined sample factors, one came across two prominent streaks in the Bihari people's overall personal image. One of the two, the positive strand, seemed exclusive for the people of this regional group and described the migrants as, *simple, modest and sensitive towards others' feelings*. Moreover, a few high loading items such as, *timid, rustic and confirmatory*, that were parts of the factors from different instances, still complemented the factor's positive configuration.

The other prominent dimension in the Bihari migrants' overall representation was negative, and emerged despite how the ratings were used for extracting the factors. For example, the migrants were rated as *law breakers and quarrelsome* according to the migrant's own self-perception, *dishonest and law breakers* (according to the combined sample factor) and *law breakers and untrustworthy* (according to the Marathi people's perception). There were a few indications that the Bihari people were clever and *practical*, knew how to manage things (*jugadi*), *wanted to become rich anyhow*, and were *untrustworthy*.

However, it was obvious that the migrants self-rated themselves significantly highly on positive attributes while the local people on the negative ones and, there were two prominent aspects of Bihari people's overall representation. The findings showed some anomalies in the nature of the factors and their constituent items when rating scores were used from different instances. This seemed probable. Further, in general, the factors did not explain large percentage of total variance and occasionally showed large standard deviations and modest factor Means.

References

- Deshingkar, P. & Atekar, S. (January, 2009). Migration and Human Development in India. United Nations Human Development Reports, Research Paper 2009/13.
- Deshingkar, P., Kumar, S., Chobey, H. K., & Kumar, D. (2006). The role of migration and remittances in promoting livelihoods in Bihar. *London: Overseas Development Institute*.
- Indian Institute of Public Administration & Rodgers, G. (2013). *The challenge of inclusive development in rural Bihar*. Institute of Human Development, Manak Publications.
- Malekar, A. (2008, July). The original migrants. InfoChange, Centre for Communication and Development Studies, InfoChange News and Features, www.infochangeindia.org.
- Sarkar, P. (September, 2019). Census snapshot out-migration from Bihar: Major reasons and destinations. *Journal of Migration Affairs, II* (1), 132-140.
- Sharma, A. N. (1997). *People on the move: nature and implications of migration in backward economy*. New Delhi: Vikas.
- Sharma, A.N. (March, 5–11, 2005). Agrarian relations and socio-economic change in Bihar. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40 (10), 960–972.
- Singh, D.P. (2005). Migration and occupation in Mumbai, issues and implications. Paper presented at the 35th International Conference of International Union for the Study of Population, Tours (France), July 18-23.
- Singh, D.P. (2007). Migration in Mumbai: Trends in fifty years. *Demography India*, 36 (2), 315-327.
-

