

Pilot Study
on
Social, Economic and Educational Status
of the Children of Migrant Labourers
in
Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India

Principal Investigator

Sanjay Kumar, Founder, Deshkal Society

Research Assistant

Shadab Anis, PhD Scholar, NUEPA
Anurag Kumar Das, Deshkal Society

Prepared by

Deshkal Society

D-205, Sector - 108

Noida-201304, Uttar Pradesh (India)

Website: www.deshkalindia.com

CONTENTS

Acknowledgment	4
Executive Summary	5
Key Findings	5
Recommendations	5
Way Forward	6
Introduction	7
Methodology	9
Key Objectives	9
Findings	33
Conclusion	34
Reference	35
Appendix	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by their Gender	10
Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by their Religion	10
Table 3: Distribution of Respondents by Social Category	10
Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by their Location	11
Table 5: Household Size (No of Family Members)	11
Table 6: Gender of Respondent's Family Member	12
Table 7: Education of Respondent's Family Member	12
Table 8: Status of Employment of Respondent's Family Member	13
Table 9: Family Monthly Income	14
Table 10: Able to Save Money in the Last Month	14
Table 11: Availability of Adhar of Respondent's Family Member	15
Table 12: Type of Home	16
Table 13: Access to Basic Facilities in Households	16
Table 14: Awareness About Free and Compulsory Education Under the Right to Education Act (2009)	17
Table 15: Availing Benefits from RTE, Act, 2009	18
Table 16: Distribution of the Total Number of Children by Types of School	18
Table 17: Reasons to Choose Government School	19
Table 18: Duration of Attending School in a Year	21
Table 19: Reasons Behind the Child Being Regular at School	21
Table 20: Satisfied With the Teaching-Learning Method of the School	21
Table 21: Salient Features of the Method of Teaching in school	22
Table 22: Access to Basic Facilities in School	22
Table 23: Awareness About the Parent-Teacher Meeting in the School	23
Table 24: Attending the PTM	24
Table 25: Duration of the Child Attending School in a Year	24
Table 26: Reasons for Being Regular at School	24
Table 27: Information About the Absence of the Student via Telephone/Message by the School	25
Table 28: Satisfaction with the Teaching-Learning Method of the School	25
Table 29: Awareness of the Parent-Teacher Meeting Conducted in the School	25

Table 30: Attending the PTM	26
Table 31: Details of Children by their Age Group	26
Table 32: Average Private Cost of Education	27
Table 33: Enrolled in Tuition by Households	27
Table 34: Factors Behind a Child Enrolling in Tuition	28
Table 35: Details of Children by type of Tuition (Home, online, coaching)	29
Table 36: Details of Children by Tuition Fee	29
Table 37: Details of Children by mode of Transport for Tuition	30
Table 38: Subject-wise Details of Children Taking Tuition	30
Table 39: Not Enrolled in Private/Government School Between the Age Group 6-14	31
Table 40: Dropout Children Between the Age of 6-14 Years	31
Table 41: Capability of Browsing the Internet by Household	32
Table 42: Access to Digital Devices Household	32
Table 43: Reason to Use the Internet	33

LIST OF BOXES

Box 1: Choice of sending Children to Government Schools	19
Box 2: Choice of sending Children to Private Schools	20
Box 3: Stress among Parents	27
Box 4: Sending children to Private Tutions	28
Box 5: Denied Enrolment in Government School	31

Acknowledgment

We would like to extend our sincere gratitude to the individuals who have played a significant role in the completion of this study. Their contributions have been invaluable, and we are grateful for their guidance, support, and expertise.

We would like to thank Dr. Sujeet Ram Tripathy, Assistant Professor at the University of Delhi, provided valuable insights and raised important questions that helped shape our interview schedule.

During the data collection process, Sanjeev Kumar, Project Coordinator at Deshkal Society, demonstrated remarkable commitment and leadership in coordinating the data collection efforts with the selected respondents.

Radheshyam Mangolpuri, Consultant, led the focused group discussions and one-on-one interviews with respondents, drafting a comprehensive report based on qualitative data that complements the quantitative findings of the study.

Amardeep Kumar, PhD scholar at NUEPA, Delhi, for his valuable contributions in identifying secondary literature and highlighting key findings, which helped in shaping the literature review.

Sunil Kumar, Data Entry Operator, for his meticulous work in completing the data entry and tabulation within the scheduled timeframe.

Dr. Binodanand Jha, Former Director, Dept. of Education, Bihar, has been instrumental in helping us plan the next stage of the report's development.

We are also grateful to Dr. Manoj Kumar Tiwary, Researcher and Education Consultant, for his insightful comments that have contributed to the success of this research report.

Dr. Ajay K Chaubey, an educationist and Principal of Sarvodaya Bal Vidyalaya, Rouse Avenue, New Delhi, for his consistent efforts in finalizing the report and providing valuable insights, which have contributed to the development of the framework of this report.

Dr. Arvind K Mishra, Assistant Professor, J.N.U, for sharing his insightful points, which greatly enhanced our understanding and deepened our perspective.

We would also like to thank Dr. Shushmita Dutt, Educationist, Delhi for her thorough review of the report, which provided valuable input that helped refine our recommendations and way forward.

Special thanks go to Surbhi Mauray, Communications Officer at Deshkal Society, for creating a positive and encouraging atmosphere that allowed our team to work effectively.

Lastly, we acknowledge the formidable commitment of the community members who have been our partners throughout this study. Their participation has been instrumental in making this research possible.

Executive summary

Access and participation of migrant children in school education require close and critical inquiry. Despite the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (RTE Act) as a right and the international conventions ratified by the Indian government such as Sustainable Development Goal 4 to improve access to quality education and participation seems a distant dream. Keeping this in view the present study was undertaken to ascertain the status and access to education of migrant children's households in Noida, Gautam Buddha Nagar of Uttar Pradesh. The primary study covered 42 migrant households with 170 family members.

The peculiar condition of the selected households is that most of them are engaged in temporary, irregular, and insecure employment leading to a fragile nature of work. Both mother and parents are involved in work to get more income in the household leading to the absence of parental support at home in studies. They are settlers' migrants, however, rooted in their state from where they belong. The children are away from education for at least two months when they visit their home state for marriage ceremonies, rituals, and festivals. The salient findings of the study are as follows:

Key Findings

- There is a considerable demand for education among migrant households, particularly for private schooling. Out of 42 households, 15 have no children between the ages of 6 and 14. There are just two houses who send their children to public schools (4.76%), whereas the bulk of the households send their children to private schools (57.14%).
- Apart from private schooling the children from migrant households also attend private tuition. 63% of households sent their children to private tuition.
- The parents are employed in temporary, insecure, and irregular jobs, which makes their livelihood precarious. To supplement the family's finances, both parents work. In absence of parental home support in studies, the children are taking private tuitions.
- It's fascinating to see that 61.90% of households are unaware of the RTE Act. Meanwhile 39.10% are aware of free and compulsory education under RTE, Act, 2009.
- 92% of the households reported that they are aware of the parent-teacher meeting in schools and 8% mentioned that they did not have any information about any kind of parent-teacher interaction.
- None of the parents attended parent-teacher meetings in government schools. One of the households was not aware about the parent-teacher meeting.
- 96% of households stated that their children attended school for nine months, while 4% reported that their children attended school occasionally. In other words, some youngsters do not attend school on a regular basis.
- The children lack access to computers at home and limited exposure to technology at their schools.
- 95.24% of households said they could browse the internet. While 4.76% of families indicated they did not know how to use the internet.

Recommendation

- The Right to Education mandates access, quality and compulsory education for the children belonging to 6-14 years of age must be effectively implemented on ground.
- NEP 2020 envisages the proper integration of grade 1-3 and it must be implemented on

ground effectively.

- A Policy Framework for Migrant Children is required. Different stakeholders, including government officials, corporations, school decision-making bodies, and non-governmental organisations, can collaborate to develop the policy framework.
- There is a shortage of data on the educational needs of migrating children. It is of vital necessity to generate data utilising the mixed-method approach in order to formulate policies and plans of action.
- Acknowledge the need for children to learn in an atmosphere where technology accentuates their entrenched desire to explore and acquire skill and knowledge. There is an urgent need to build an ecosystem where social and economic background is not the impediment to acquire computing skills for building knowledge.
- The teacher must be sensitised about how to deal with students from migratory backgrounds. Sensitization can be incorporated in B.El.Ed courses created by DIET and SCERT, and must be implemented during coursework and training at the level of block and cluster resource centers.
- Organise, form a group of Parents and Teachers for monthly meetings and orientation for creating a learning environment within homes.

Way Forward

- Migrant children do not receive adequate home learning support. Learning centres must be established to meet the educational needs of children. Learning centres can collaborate with schools and communities to increase engagement and better understand the needs of children. Parents can be encouraged to participate actively in these learning centres.
- In order to increase community awareness, the school could hold an enrolment campaign camp, particularly near migrant labour colonies. Furthermore, the documents required for admission, such as Aadhar, should be valid for children as well as parents of the current residency or another origin.
- There is an urgent need to set up a basic computer learning center through which the children will learn typing skills, Microsoft office, Canva and basic Web Designing.
- Gautam Buddha Nagar district is rapidly developing as a corporate hub, thus there is a possibility that they may step up to assist, and support, the children's immediate needs, thereby mitigating the many restraints.
- It is also critical to establish networks with other stakeholders such as residential welfare associations, parent representatives, non-governmental organisations, and corporations.

Introduction

India has made a significant breakthrough in providing universal elementary education. In 2002, Article 21 (A) was revised, and the Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act was enacted in 2009, which adopted a right-based approach to make education an essential component of the lives of children aged 6-14 years. This act is added under Article 21 of the Indian constitution woven into the right to life because a worthwhile life must have dignity, which education promises to provide (Kumar, 2022). The constitutional commitment envisions achieving universalization of quality education within a reasonable period to care for countless children whose right to education and dignity has been affirmed for the first time in the history of this country. Education, especially primary education, and socio-economic mobility are possible with higher attainment of education. All rights, including human rights, depend upon education because it ensures the cumulative and wholesome growth of the children.

The aim is to mainstream the pathways of social upliftment to the historically marginalized and exploited communities and groups in modern times through education. Almost all initiatives and policies are envisioned to address socioeconomic and educational gaps in enrolment, retention, and learning attainment. The different educational policies emphasize the importance of equalizing educational opportunities and allowing the marginalized, backward, or underprivileged classes to use education to improve their precarious life situations. The educational situation of children is influenced by various factors such as their socio-economic background, spatial location identities and living conditions, teacher responsiveness, and school infrastructure. Addressing issues like limited school access, teacher attitudes, school quality, cramped living conditions and lack of home support is essential for improving education belonging to marginalised children. Similarly, NEP 2020 seeks to see education holistically, attempting to expand compulsory education coverage from pre-primary to secondary education for all children aged 3 to 18 years. In truth, the centrally endorsed Samagra Shiksha, which extends schooling to all children aged 3 to 18, is a unique vision of national devotion to providing universal quality education to all including urban migrant children.

India's urban areas have expanded rapidly due to the increase in population, despite steady economic growth. However, people in rural areas and backward states, especially those belonging to marginalized communities, face difficulties in fulfilling their basic needs such as food, healthcare, and education. Consequently, many migrate to urban areas in search of better livelihoods but end up with low-paying informal jobs due to their low educational levels. Even those who have lived in cities for years struggle to survive due to a lack of proper work, better wages, and income. Those who migrate to cities are compelled to live in informal settlements, worksites, on pavements, and beside railway tracks in extreme subhuman conditions. Urban locations are recognized as the site of transformations; however, urban spaces are also locations of inequalities, discrimination, and exclusion.

According to the 2011 Census, 455 million people - or almost 37% of the nation's total population - were migrants based on their place of last residence.¹ However, there is no appropriate method to count them all, hence the actual number may be more than that. The migrations were (either interstate

¹<https://iasp.ac.in/uploads/journal/10.%20Migration%20in%20India%20trends%20and%20characteristics-1669206793.pdf>

or intrastate with a migration duration of 0 to 9 years). Out of the total migrant population, around 2.12 crore children aged 5-14 years had migrated, accounting for almost 15% of the total migrant population in 2011. It is worth noting that the total number of children who migrated constituted eight percent of the total child population in the country in 2011. The reasons for migration include work and employment, business, education, marriage, and movement after childbirth. The challenge and problem with such a huge migration is that it adversely affects the education of the children who migrate with their parents. The Global Educational Monitoring Report, 2019 also highlighted that the internal migration is the major challenge for the education of the children².

However, India has rendered school education a fundamental right for all children and claims that access and participation have been universalised at the national level, though the reality is different from the claim. Census 2011 data confirms similar patterns, with the participation rate of children aged 6-14 years being found to be 84 percent, leaving approximately ten million children out of school. According to the 75th Round of NSSO data on Household Social Consumption on Education in India (2017-18), the Gross Attendance Ratio (GAR) at the primary level is 100 percent for urban areas. However, the Net Attendance Ratio (NAR) at the primary level is 87.7 percent exclusively in metropolitan regions. NAR in the upper primary level reached 73.5 percent.

The data also presents an alarming picture that 19% of males and 17% of females between the ages of 3-35 were never enrolled because of financial constraints. According to the 2011 Census of India, 77% of children aged 5 to 18 in urban India have access to educational institutions. The percentage of females attending educational institutions in this age group is 76.8 percent, which is marginally lower than the percentage of boys attending educational institutions (77.1 percent). According to Census of India 2011 data, 23% (22.72 million) of urban children aged 5 to 18 are not attending school. 9.1 percent of urban children (8.97 million) in the 5-18 age group used to attend school but dropped out, while 13.93 percent (13.75 million) children have never attended school.

Children from migrant families face a two-fold challenge. Firstly, if they migrate with their parents, they may end up assisting their parents in work, including hazardous situations. Secondly, if they are left behind, they may have better facilities but lack parental care and love, leading to a lack of education. Parents who migrate to cities often face challenges in accessing public distribution systems, which can lead to health risks such as malnutrition and anaemia. In the worst cases, they may face sexual harassment. Unfortunately, about 80% of seasonal migrant children in seven cities in India lack access to education near work sites, according to the Global Education Monitoring Report 2019. Additionally, migrant children may be forced to work as child labourers in various industries, including construction, brick kilns, salt production, sugar cane harvesting, stone quarrying, and plantations. However, the phenomenon of child labour is directly associated with the low wage of adults in the labour market. Additionally, around 40% of children who work have experienced abuse and exploitation. It is worth noting that all children, regardless of their migratory status, place of living, and socio-economic backgrounds, have equal fundamental rights to free and compulsory education. The report dealt with the social, economic and educational status of migrant children who are settled in the locality of Noida, Gautam Buddha Nagar.

²<https://www.right-to-education.org/resource/global-education-monitoring-report-2019-migration-displacement-and-education-building>

Methodology

A mixed-method research design has been used to collect and analyse the data for this pilot study. A detailed review of literature, reports, and census data has been done to identify the gaps. Focus group discussions with communities and in-depth interviews with parents based on semi-structured open-ended questionnaires and close-ended structured questionnaires were used to collect quantitative and qualitative data. For this pilot study one cluster of phase Shramik colony which is divided into 6 phases consisting of 2040 households has been chosen. This study was administered in one of the clusters in Phase II of the Shramik colony. Every cluster consists of 60 households and 42 households have participated in this pilot study. The tabulated data has been descriptively analysed.

Location of the Study

Gautam Buddha Nagar is a district in the state of Uttar Pradesh. According to the 2011 Indian census, this district has a population of 16,48,115. The district has a density of 912, which is higher than the state's average population of 829 people per square kilometre. This district is more urbanised, with 40.9 percent of the population living in rural regions and 59.1% in urban areas. The district has 59.1 percent of the urban population, compared to the state's urban areas, which have 22.3 percent. In terms of the sex ratio (851), it is lower than the state average of 912 females for every thousand males. Gautam Buddha Nagar district ranks 1st in literacy with 80.1 percent which is higher than the state average of 67.7 percent. Greater Noida is the district administrative headquarters. The district is divided administratively into three blocks: Dadri, Gautam Buddha Nagar, and Jewar. The district is divided into four development blocks: Bsrakh, Dadri, Dankaur, and Jewar.

The Shramik settlement is located within the Bsrakh block, which has been designated for pilot research. The sex ratio of the block is 846. The literacy rate in the block is 79.51%. Noida and Greater Noida are twin cities with great growth potential, notably in the industrial sector. This has seen exponential growth in information technology and business hubs, resulting in massive infrastructure growth. Because of the unique nature of the space, it attracts a huge number of labourers from around the country, justifying the need for the study.

Key Objectives of the Study

1. To generate the data on socioeconomic and educational backgrounds of parents and find the factors influencing their choice of the school for their children, including both low-paid private schools and government schools.
2. To identify the constraints and needs of children on ensuring quality education which meets the Sustainable Development Goal 4, which aims to provide access to quality education for all.
3. To recommend a way forward to ensure quality education for children belonging to migrant families in urban locations.

Socio-Economic Demographic Details of the Households

Table 1: Distribution of respondents by their gender

Gender	Number	Percent
Male	9	21.43%
Female	33	78.57%
Total	42	100.00%

78.57% of the respondents were women while 21.43% were males. These findings indicated that the male members are mostly working and females are mostly at home.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents by their religion

Religion	Number	Percent
Hindu	41	97.62%
Muslim	1	2.38%
Total	42	100.00%

According to the table, 97.62% of the households belong to Hindu religious groups and 2.38% belong to Muslim minority groups in the selected households.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents by social category

Category	Number	Percent
General	23	54.76%
OBC	13	30.95%
EBC	2	4.76%
SC	3	7.14%
ST	1	2.38%
Total	42	100.00%

According to the social category of respondents, the majority of sampled migrant households (54.76%) fall into the general group. 4.76% of respondents come from Extremely Backward Caste communities. Other backward classes account for 30.95%. Schedule Caste and Scheduled Tribes account for 7.14% and 2.38%, respectively.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents by their Location

Location	Number	Percent
West Bengal	4	9.52%
Bihar	11	26.19%
Jharkhand	1	2.38%
M.P	1	2.38%
UP	24	57.14%
Uttarakhand	1	2.38%
Total	42	100.0%

Around 57.14% of the sampled households have migrated from the state of Uttar Pradesh which is the highest followed by 26.19% migrated from Bihar. 9.52%, 2.38%, and 2.38% of households have migrated from the states of West Bengal, Jharkhand, and Madhya Pradesh respectively.

Table 5: Household size (no of family members)

Household Size (in Nos.)	Number	Percent
2	1	2.38%
3	12	28.57%
4	17	40.48%
5	10	23.81%
7	2	4.76%
Grand Total	42	100.00%

The table shows the household size distribution for a total of 42 households. The majority of households have 3 or 4 members, with 28.57% and 40.48% respectively. 2-person households make up 2.38% of the total, while 5-person households make up 23.81%, and 7-person households make up 4.76%.

Table 6: Age Group of respondent's family member

Age Group	Number	Percent
0-5 Years	12	7.06%
6-14 Years	32	18.82%
15-25 Years	42	24.71%
26-35 Years	32	18.82%
36-45 Years	29	17.06%
46-55 Years	14	8.24%
56-65 Years	7	4.12%
More than 65 Years	2	1.18%
Grand Total	170	100.00%

The data provides insights into the age distribution within selected households. This is divided into age groups: 0-5 years and 7.06% belongs to this age group, 18.82% belongs to the 6-14 years age group which is the focus group of this report, 24.71% belongs to 15-25 years, 18.82% falls in 26-35 years, 17.06 belongs to 36-45 years, 8.24% to 46-55 years, 4.12% belongs to 56-65, and 1.18% belongs to above 65 years. Each age group has a different percentage of the total population and represents a different stage of life, with potential implications for care, education, career development, and other societal factors. There is a direct relation between the size of the family and the chances of getting an education for the children. More family members require more income for livelihood which affects the educational opportunities of the children. Children will be compelled to work to meet the basic needs of their families (Chugh, 2011).

Table 7: Gender of respondent's family member

Gender	Number	Percent
Male	95	55.88%
Female	75	44.12%
Grand Total	170	100.00%

The population consists of 95 males, making up 55.88% of the total, indicating that males are the majority gender in the sample. Understanding the male demographic composition is crucial for addressing gender-specific issues, healthcare considerations, and social dynamics within the sampled population. Additionally, there are 75 females, comprising 44.12% of the total population, indicating that females represent a significant portion of the sample.

Table 8: Education of respondent's family member

Education	Number	Percent
Illiterate	19	11.18%
Literate	22	12.94%
Primary	23	13.53%
Upper Primary	16	9.41%
Secondary	20	11.76%
Higher Secondary	31	18.24%
Graduate	11	6.47%
Post Graduate	17	10.00%
Technical	4	2.35%
Play School	6	3.53%
Others	1	0.59%
Grand Total	170	100.00%

According to the survey conducted in the households, 11.18% of the family members are illiterate and have no basic education, which poses significant challenges in accessing information and participating fully in society. On the other hand, 12.94% of household family members reported being literate. In terms of educational categories, 13.53% of the members in selected households fall under the primary education category, while 9.41% are classified under upper primary education. Additionally, 11.76% of the population have attained secondary education, and 18.24% belong to the higher secondary education category. Furthermore, 6.47% of individuals have attained a graduate degree, while post-graduate degrees account for 10.00% of the population. A smaller percentage, 2.35%, have technical education, and 3.53% have attended play school. Lastly, individuals falling under the "Others" category account for 0.59% of the population.

The education of the parents is one of the most important aspects that determine the education of the children (Ersado, 2005). Access to education, lower dropout rates, and high attendance rates are positively linked with the educational level of parents (Al Samarai & Peasgood, 1998; Ainsworth et al., 2005). The educational qualifications of the family members of the children affect not only the income of the household but also the ability to help the children complete their homework. In the absence of such support, the children are left alone to do the homework.

Table 9: Status of employment of respondent's family member

Status	Number	Percent
Niyojit (Contractual)	36	21.18%
Unemployed	8	4.71%
Seasonal Worker	4	2.35%
Housewife	33	19.41%
Student	53	31.18%
Others ³	36	21.18%
Grand Total	170	100.00%

Regarding the household occupation 21.18% of family members of the respondent's households are working on a contractual (Niyojit) basis, which does not ensure dignified monthly salaries and work without any job or other security. 4.71% of the family members are reported as unemployed with no source of income. 2.35% of the family members are seasonal workers. Seasonal workers typically engage in temporary or seasonal employment based on specific industries or activities. 19.41% of women belonging to survey households are housemakers. The largest group comprises students, representing 31.18% of the population. 21.18% of the family members have reported as others in response to types of employment.

Table 10: Family monthly income

Monthly Income	Number	Percent
1000-5000	1	2.38%
5000-10000	1	2.38%
10000-20000	19	45.24%
20000-40000	19	45.24%
40000 and More	1	2.38%
No Response	1	2.38%
Total	42	100.0%

This figure shows the monthly income of the household. 2.38% of the household has income between 1000-5000 per month while the other 2.38% household has income between 5000-10000 thousand.

³ Others include vegetable sellers, hawkers, rickshaw pullers, carpenters, mason etc.

45.24 % of the household has an income between 10000-20000, and the other 45.24% income ranges from 20000-40000. Only 2.38% of the households have more than 40000 thousand in income per month, and 2.38% of households have not responded. This monthly income fluctuates and often depends on the availability of the work in the case of daily wage labourers.

There is a direct relation between the educational qualification and the nature of work. The nature of work determines the income of the household. There is a wide gap between skilled and unskilled jobs in urban India, and hence, it is important to harness job opportunities, skills, and education needs to be enhanced (Awasthi, Kashyap, and Yagnik, 2009). There is congruence between the informal sector and poverty which is further related to other disadvantages like caste and level of education, which are critical for job opportunities. The informalization of the formal sector is characterized by a shift in formally recognized and regulated employment towards exhibiting traits traditionally associated with informal work. This trend, as identified by the National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganized Sector (NCEUS, 2007), is marked by a reduction in job security, benefits, and legal protections that are typically associated with formal employment. In formal sectors, workers are entitled to legal and social protections such as employment contracts, health benefits, social security, and compliance with labour laws. However, the process of formalization involves an erosion or bypassing of these protections.

For example, a security guard working for a multinational corporation might be employed through a subcontractor or an outsourcing firm, despite the company's formal sector operations and adherence to regulatory frameworks. This employment arrangement can result in the guard not receiving the same benefits and protections as regular employees of the company, including permanent contracts, health insurance, paid leave, and pension schemes. Consequently, the guard's employment conditions resemble those of the informal sector, characterized by job insecurity, the absence of social benefits, and often lower wages.

The urban informal workers are considered to be the free riders of the facilities provided by the government, although it is also important to recognize their contribution to making these cities, and day to day functioning of the city depends on these people. It is also important to keep in mind that the individual who works in the informal sector does not get regular work, and the monthly income may fluctuate. It is evident from other studies that the education of the parents and their income level directly affects the educational status of the children (Bryk and Thum, 1989). Higher parental income encourages them to spend more on their children's education.

Table 11: Able to save money in the last month

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	15	35.71%
No	26	61.90%
No Response	1	2.38%
Total	42	100.0%

As apparent from the Table, 61.90% of the households could not save money in the last month at the time of the survey. Reasons for not saving are multiple, such as no income, less income, more expenses, and expenditures on health and education.

Table 12: Availability of Adhar of respondent's family member

Status	Number	Percent
Available	162	95.29%
Unavailable	8	4.71%
Grand Total	170	100.00%

The finding reveals that 95.29 percent of family members in 42 households have Aadhar cards, while 4.71% do not. The unavailability of Aadhar may lead to the exclusion of migrant households from accessing welfare schemes, for instance, the PDS ration under the one nation, one ration scheme.

Housing and Amenities

Table 13: Type of Home

Response	Number	Percent
Own	7	16.67%
Rented	35	83.33%
Total	42	100.0%

The table indicates that 83.33% of households live in rented housing, while 16.67 households own their own homes. Those who live in rented flats must pay rent every month, causing additional financial hardship for households.

Table 14: Access to basic facilities in households

Facilities	Response
Number of rooms	1 room-34 (80.95%), 2 rooms-8 (19.05)
Separate Kitchen	No
Separate Bathroom	Yes (35.71%), No (64.29%)
Current value	1-Rs. 1,00,000/-, 2-Rs. 100000, 2-Rs. 12,00,000, 2-No idea
Electricity	100% Available
Source of Water	100% Tap
Availability of water	Sufficient (42.86%), for less time(57.14%)
Drinking water	Available (19.05), Purchase from Outside (80.95)
Type of toilets	Septic (97.62%), Sulabh type (2.38%)
Dumping wastage	Dustbin provided by NDA
Collection of wastage by NDA	Daily (95.24%), Irregular (4.76%)

It is also worth noting that 80.95 percent of homes have only one room, while 19.05% have two. None of the households has a separate kitchen. All of the homes have electricity and running water. However, 42.86% of homes have enough water, while the remaining 57.14% do not have it all the time. In terms of drinking water, only 19.05% of households have access to it at home, while 80.95% buy it from elsewhere. 97.62% of houses have septic toilets, whereas 2.38% have Sulabh toilets. The NDA has provided a waste bin, and 95.24% of households indicated that the NDA collects garbage daily, with 4.76% reporting irregular collection.

There are only seven households that own houses. The data provided consists of responses from seven individuals regarding the current value of their owned houses. To present this information in a more academic manner, consider the following rephrased explanation: This question determines the current value of respondents' owned houses yielded the following results:

One respondent estimated the value of their house at Rs. 100,000, Two respondents provided a value of Rs. 100000. Two respondents estimated the value at Rs. 1,200,000. Two respondents were unable to estimate the value of their house, indicating 'No idea'.

These findings suggest a range of perceived property values among the respondents, indicating variation in the economic status and market conditions of their respective properties. The repetition of certain property values among different respondents highlights the possibility of clustered property values within specific ranges. Additionally, the presence of two respondents who were unable to

estimate the value of their house signifies a gap in property valuation knowledge. This gap could be attributed to various factors such as limited access to market information, lack of financial literacy, or unawareness of recent changes in property values.

Educational Status of Children

Information on Educational Policies

Table 15: Awareness about free and compulsory education under the Right to Education Act (2009)

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	16	38.10%
No	26	61.90%
Total	42	100.00%

The following table shows the percentage of households familiar with the Right to Education Act of 2009. It is quite interesting to note that 61.90% of households lack information about the RTE Act. This can be seen as a failure on the part of the government, as the focus and purpose of this act is to achieve universalization of primary education. The government's responsible for making parents aware of this act, its purpose, and the importance of basic education, especially for marginalized children who are out of school or dropping out. The RTE Act was shifted from a directive principle to fundamental rights, highlighting the importance of parental involvement in fulfilling this act through community participation. The lack of awareness among parents about this act is a serious cause for concern.

Table 16: Availing benefits from RTE, Act, 2009

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	3	7.41%
No	39	92.85.0%
Total	42	100.0%

Table 17: Distribution of the households by type of School.

Response	Number	Percent
Government School	2	4.76%
Private School	24	57.14%
Both	1	2.38%
No child to study	15	35.71%
Total	42	100.00%

Out of 42 households, there are 15 households where there are no children belonging to 6-14 years of age. There is only one household that sends their children to public schools, which is 4.76%, and the majority of households send their children to private schools, which is 57.14%. The findings further suggest that the children attend both public and private schools in one of the households. One child attends private school while the other attends government schools. The mushrooming of Private schools across the region to fill the gap left by government schooling. Parents invest their hard-earned money in paying fees, which shows the trend of high demand for private schooling compared to the government. This presents a very aspirational picture of the educational landscape of migrant children. The parents, especially from marginalized communities, perceived from their experiences that the government schools failed them, and people are losing faith in formal public schools. The people who cannot afford to send their children to private schools are reducing their other expenses and spending on private education.

Box 1: Choice of sending children to government schools

Economic constraints are a major factor in a parent's decision-making. They believe that there is no significant difference in the quality of education between private and government schools. Parents are drawn to government schools because of the benefits they offer, including free education, meals, textbooks, scholarships, and uniforms. Furthermore, many parents have personal experiences with government schools, having attended or sent their children to these schools, and report that they have received reasonable facilities and education as expected. Additionally, parents with three or more children in school struggle to afford the fees of private schools and therefore, do not perceive a significant difference between the two types of schools.

The quality of education provided by private and government institutions persists and is contested in academic discourse. Instead of reinforcing the binary, evaluating the quality of education at private schools is important. Despite rising demand, the provision of government schools in cities remains limited due to migration and urbanisation. Access to education should be equal for both boys and girls, regardless of socioeconomic status. Low-cost private schools are popular among children from

underserved neighbourhoods who cannot afford more expensive options. Critics claim that private education diminishes the intrinsic value of education and may undermine its public benefit. Low-cost private schools are expanding to satisfy the educational needs of marginalised children (Tooley and Dixon, 2007). Advocates of these schools say that they play a crucial role in providing quality education.

The Right to Education (RTE) Act of 2009 has led to many schools being closed due to inadequate facilities, while government schools with poor infrastructure remain open. Parents may choose low-cost schools over government schools due to their lower tuition (Kingdon, 2017).

According to a study by EdCIL (2014), half of the students who attended private schools dropped out (PwC-2015, p. 124). In other words, it can be said that it is not easy to retain children from poor urban households in private schools, which leads to dropout (Agarwal and Chugh, 2003). Tsujita (2009) argues that children from slums are more likely to attend government schools rather than low-cost private schools. As the economic ladder goes up the percentage of private school-going children increases, and the percentage of children attending government school comes down (Ramachandran, 2012). Despite the low demand for government schooling among migrant families, it is critical to understand the choice of parents about public education. In many instances, when a household's income improves, the child may transfer to private schools, and when the income decreases, the children will either be out of school or attend a government school. This phenomenon puts the education of migrant children in danger if the income is reduced, and covid can be one of the intriguing examples of loss of income.

Box 2: Choice of Sending Children to Private Schools.

Parents believe that private schools offer better education, with advantages in subject matter, teaching methods, extracurricular activities, homework, and regular monitoring of student's progress. Private schools also hold regular parent-teacher meetings, where teachers share their student's performance updates with parents on a fortnightly basis. This close monitoring and feedback is seen as an important aspect of private school education. Furthermore, the research team observed that parents are also influenced by social pressure, as they perceive that their neighbours' children are attending private schools and, therefore feel pressure to follow suit. Many parents also recognize that they come from distant regions, such as Bihar or West Bengal, and aspire to secure better job opportunities for their children. They believe that good English skills are essential for achieving these goals and therefore value private schools' reputation for providing effective English education.

Table 18: Reasons to choose government school

Response	Number	Percent
Free Education	2	66.67%
Scholarship	1	33.33%
Total	3	100.00%

The children who are attending government schools belong to only three households out of 27. Two households chose government schools because it is free of cost and one household chose them because it provides scholarships to the children.

Table 19: Duration of attending government school in a year

Response	Number	Percent
9 Months	2	66.67%
More than 9 months	1	33.33%
Total	3	100.00%

In regards to the duration of attending the school in a year. Two households reported that their children attend school nine months in a year and one household reported that their children attend more than nine months in a year.

Table 20: Reasons behind the child being regular at government school

Response	Number	Percent
Scholarship	1	33.33%
Good Teacher	2	66.67%
Total	3	100.00%

Two of the households responded that if the children are absent from school, the school informs the parents via telephone or message. However, one of the households said that they did not get any information through messages or phone calls.

Table 21: Satisfied with the teaching-learning method of the government school

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	3	100.0
No	0	0.0
Total	3	100.0

All households that send their children to government schools have reported being satisfied with the school's teaching-learning method.

Table 22: Reason of attraction toward Government School

Response	Number	Percent
Teacher Behaviour	3	100.0
Total	3	100.0%

Table 23: Access to basic facilities in government School

	Number		Percentage
Access to textbooks free at the school	Yes	0	0.0
	No	3	100.0
	Total	3	100.0
Free distribution of uniforms provided by the school	Yes	0	0.0
	No	3	100.0
	Total	3	100.0
Access to scholarship in schools	Yes	1	33.33
	No	2	66.67
	Total	3	100.0
Mid-day in school	Yes	0	0.0
	No	3	100.0
	Total	3	100.0

Three households who send their children to government schools have reported that their children did not receive any free textbooks and uniforms from the schools. In such circumstances, the parents have to spend their hard-earned money to buy books from the market which leads to the financial burden on households. Despite the provision to provide free uniforms and textbooks education in public schools still, the children are deprived of ale. additional still costs like stationary, exercise books and meals are borne by the household. Two of the households reported that their children have received scholarships, and one of the households said no scholarship was received.

None of the children belonging to these three households who attend government schools get mid-day meals in school, violating educational policies that require mid-day meals for all children.

Table 24: Awareness about the parent-teacher meeting in the government school

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	1	33.33%
No	2	66.67%
Total	3	100.00%

The RTE Act 2009 envisages enhancing the education of the school through the active participation of community members. Apart from the School Member Committee, in which the parents are also members, regular parent-teacher meetings are organized to update the children's overall learning process for teachers. However, only one household said that they were aware of the parent-teacher meeting in school, and two of the households said they did not have any information about it.

Table 25: Attending the PTM in Government School

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	0	0.0
No	3	100.0
Total	3	100.0

According to the table, none of the households attended parent-teacher meetings in public schools. One of the households had information about PTM, but they did not attend.

Private Schooling

Table 26: Duration of the child attending private school in a year

Response	Number	Percent
9 Months	24	96.00%
Sometimes	1	4.00%
Total	25	100.0

According to the table, 96% of households have reported that their children attend school for 9 months, and 4% reported that their children attend school sometimes. In other words, the children attending school sometimes do not regularly go to school.

Table 27: Reasons for being regular at private school

Response	Number	Percent
Teacher Behaviour	1	4.00%
Good Study	22	88.00%
Teacher Behaviour & Good Study	2	8.00%
Total	25	100.0

In response to the question about the reason to be regular at school, 4% of households have said the teacher's behaviour is the reason, 88% have reported that good study is the cause, and 8% have reported that teacher behaviour and behaviour are both the reasons. Taking this understanding forward, it can be said that the primary reason for sending the children to private schooling is that it is a good way to study, and the parents take their children's education seriously.

Table 28: Information about the absence of the student via telephone/ message by the private school

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	21	84.00%
No	4	16.00%
Total	25	100.0

In regards to the table 84% of the households responded that if the children are absent from school, the school informs the parents via telephone or message. However, 16% of households said that they did not get any information through messages or phone calls.

Table 29: Satisfaction with the teaching-learning method of the private school

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	23	92.00%
No	2	8.00%
Total	25	100.0

It is interesting to note that 92% of the households have reported that they are satisfied with the teaching-learning method of the school. However, 8% of households have mentioned that they are not satisfied with the teaching-learning process in school.

Table 30: Awareness of the parent-teacher meeting conducted in the private school

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	23	92.00%
No	2	8.00%
Total	25	100.0

According to the table, 92% of the households reported that they are aware of parent-teacher meetings in schools, and 8% mentioned that they did not have any information about any kind of parent-teacher interaction.

Table 31: Attending the PTM

Response	Number	Percent
Every month	3	13.04%
Every 6 months	10	43.48%
Sometimes	9	39.13%
Never	1	4.35%
Total	23	100.0

As apparent in the table, 13.04%, 43.48%, and 39.13% of households have reported that they attend a parent-teacher meeting every month, every six months, and sometimes, respectively. 4.35% said that they have never attended parent-teacher meetings.

Box 3: Stress among parents

One of the striking observations made by the research team was the difficulty parents, particularly mothers, faced in managing their time effectively for their children. Specifically, they struggled to balance their children's homework, sending them to Anandshala, and attending parent-teacher meetings regularly. The primary reason for this was that most parents held low-paying jobs, with mothers often working as domestic help in nearby houses. As a result, they spent more than ten hours a day working outside the home, leaving them with little time to devote to their children after school. Furthermore, they were under immense pressure to earn a living to support their families, leading to feelings of anxiety and stress. Consequently, their behaviour often affected their children directly, and instances of anger, physical violence, and other forms of distress were commonly observed in these families.

Table 32: Details of children by their age group

Age (years)	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-5 Yrs	5	19.23%	1	5.00%	6	13.04%
6-14 Yrs	13	50.00%	15	75.00%	28	60.87%
15-25 Yrs	8	30.77%	4	20.00%	12	26.09%
Grand Total	26	100.00%	20	100.00%	46	100.00%

The total number of children between 6 and 14 in 27 surveyed households is 13 boys and 15 girls. The other remaining 15 households do not have children to send them to school.

Table 33: Average monthly/yearly private cost of education

Description	Average amount of fees (In Rs.)
	All
Monthly fees	883
School Dress	1535
Books	3067
Stationary	1408

The average monthly fee paid by the migrant household is eight hundred eighty-three rupees. Apart from monthly school fees, the migrant household also has to spend money on average on school uniforms, around one thousand five hundred fifty-five rupees, three thousand sixty-seven rupees on books, and one thousand four hundred eighty rupees stationary.

Private Tuition

Table 34: Enrolled in tuition by households

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	17	62.96%
No	10	37.04%
Total	27	100.0

According to the table, 63% of households send their children to private tuition, and 37% of households do not send their children to any kind of tuition. The critical aspect of private tuition, sometimes known as ‘Shadow Education,’ might undermine school curricula by setting its own pace, priorities, and learning order. Collectively, these factors can contribute to or worsen classroom inequality (Bray, 2007). While it is debatable whether private tuition improves or hinders learning outcomes, it does provide valuable inputs that cannot be overlooked. However, it is intriguing to note that the majority of the migrant children are attending private schools. Apart from private schooling, they are also attending private tuition.

Box 4: Sending children to private tuition.

The research team observed a remarkable surge in the growth of tuition centers in the locality. The primary reasons are:

1. The demand for homework help by parents and their children, as assigned by the school.
2. The fact that many mothers are illiterate or lack access to formal education rendering them unable to provide adequate support to their children with their homework.
3. Parents must work long hours to support their families, which results in their absence from home when the children return from school.

As a result, parents are compelled to send their children to tuition centers, which charge an average of ₹300 to ₹500. The tutors in these centers can be categorized into two types: those who have previously taught in private schools and those who hold graduate or postgraduate degrees.

Table 35: Factors behind a child enrolling in tuition by households

Response	Number	Percent
Weak in English	1	5.88
Weak in English and Math	4	23.53
Weak in Math	2	11.76
Weak in Study	2	11.76
No Response	5	29.41
Other	3	17.65
Total	17	100.00

The reason for enrolling in tuition varies, and 5.88%, 23.53%, 11.76%, and 11.76% of the households said that they send their children to tuition because the children are weak in English, weak in English and Math, and Weak in Math, respectively. 29.41% of the households have given no response. 17.65% of households have reported as other, which is that the children are not interested in being taught by parents.

Table 36: Details of children by type of tuition (home, online, coaching)

Type of Tuition	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Coaching	10	58.82%	4	33.33%	14	48.28%
Tuition at Home	7	41.18%	8	66.67%	15	51.72%
Grand Total	17	100.00%	12	100.00%	29	100.00%

58.82% of boys attend coaching and 41% of the boys take tuition at home. While 48.28% of girls attend coaching and 51.72% of girls are taking tuition at home. Overall, 48.28% of the children are attending coaching and the remaining 51.72% are taking tuition at home.

Table 37: Details of children by tuition fee

Tuition fee	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
200	0	0.00%	2	16.67%	2	6.90%
250	2	11.76%	2	16.67%	4	13.79%
300	4	23.53%	3	25.00%	7	24.14%
400	4	23.53%	1	8.33%	5	17.24%
500	3	17.65%	2	16.67%	5	17.24%
700	0	0.00%	1	8.33%	1	3.45%
800	1	5.88%	1	8.33%	2	6.90%
1000	3	17.65%	0	0.00%	3	10.34%
Grand Total	17	100.00%	12	100.00%	29	100.00%

Overall, 6.90%, 13.79%, 24.14%, 17.24%, 17.24%, 3.45%, 6.90%, and 10.34% of children have paid two hundred rupees, two hundred fifty rupees, three hundred rupees, four hundred rupees, five hundred rupees, seven hundred rupees, eight hundred rupees and one thousand rupees respectively. Apart from monthly school fees, annual costs of uniforms and textbooks, and need-based expenses on stationery, migrant households are spending on private tuition as well.

Table 38: Details of children by mode of transport for tuition

Mode of transport	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Motor Bike	1	5.88%	0	0.00%	1	3.45%
On foot	16	94.12%	12	100.00%	28	96.55%
Grand Total	17	100.00%	12	100.00%	29	100.00%

96% of the children who attend coaching or tuition outside the home cover the distance by walking, and the remaining 3.45% take motorbikes to reach the tuition or coaching.

The findings of the study suggest that 68.97% of the migrant children took tuition for all subjects, followed by Math and Social Science which is 20.69% and 20.69% respectively. 10.34% of children took tuition or coaching for science followed by Environmental science, Hindi, and English consisting of 6.90%, 3.45%, and 3.45% respectively.

Table 39: Not enrolled in a private / government school between the age group of 6-14

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	1	2.38
No	41	97.61
Total	42	100.0

One of the households reported that their children were not enrolled in school, and the reason cited was that the school denied admission to the children, compelled them to leave the school

Box 5: Denied enrolment in government schools

Parents who wish to enrol their children in government schools often face challenges in providing necessary documentation, including proof of residence and Aadhaar cards. Due to the lack of a local address, the government school denies admission to the children, citing the requirement for a nearby residence. However, this is a contradictory stance, as the Right to Education Act, 2009 guarantees that every child aged 6-14 years has the right to education, regardless of their location within the country. The Act only requires proof of residence from anywhere in India. Despite the government's provision of various facilities, such as teaching, learning, and mid-day meals, this obstacle discourages many parents from sending their children to government schools.

Such an incident is a clear violation of the Right to Education Act, of 2009 which is a fundamental right. Under any circumstances, schools can deny admission to children and violate “*No Child Left Behind*”. Such cases further demotivate the poor and migrant parents who are losing their trust in government schools and moving to private schools.

Table 40: Dropout children between the age of 6-14 years

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	1	2.38
No	41	97.61
Total	42	100.0

Out of 42, one of the households has reported that their children have been dropped out of school. The children belong to marginalised sections, and migrant children drop out of school due to multiple factors.

Access to Information Technology and Digital Devices

Table 41: Capability of browsing the Internet by Household

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	40	95.24%
No	2	4.76%
Total	42	100.0

According to the table, 95.24% of the households have reported that they can browse the internet. While 4.76% of the households have said they do not know how to browse the internet.

Table 42: Access to digital devices household

Response (N=42)	Number	Percent
Telephone	15	35.71%
Smartphone	42	100.00%
Tablet	0	0.00%
Laptop	3	7.14%
Desktop	0	0.00%

In regards to the table discussing access to digital devices, 35.71% of households have telephones. All the 42 sampled households have smartphones leading to 100%. None of the households have any tablets or desktops. Only 7.14% of the households have access to a laptop. This is the era of technology where the teaching-learning process has been occupied by digital devices and information and knowledge are available at the fingertips. The rightful use of technology in education may have better learning outcomes. Lack of access to desktops, computers, or laptops may negatively impact the children's overall learning process.

Table 43: Reason to use the Internet

Response (N=42)	Number	Percent
Application to Govt. Scheme	10	23.81%
Banking	36	85.71%
Railway Ticket	19	45.24%
Electricity bill	26	61.90%
Mobile Recharge	35	83.33%
Gas Bill	25	59.52%
Educational information	26	61.90%
Entertainment, video call	12	28.57%

The table summarises the use of the Internet in the selected households. The maximum use of the Internet for banking-related services comprises 85.71%, followed by mobile recharge which is 83.33%. 61.90 % of the households used for educational information. 61.90% of the migrant households use the Internet to pay their electricity bills, followed by paying their gas bill and railway tickets comprising 59.52% and 45.24%. 28.57% use it for entertainment purposes and 23.81% for applying for government schemes. The findings indicate that the internet is extensively used for educational purposes and more access and careful use of the internet and digital devices may help the migrant children to access the world of knowledge.

NSSO (2017-18) gives a very intriguing image of the digital gap and exclusion in India in light of covid where education has been switched to digital form. According to the report, only 4% of rural households and 23% of urban households have computer access. Internet connectivity is available to 15% of rural homes and 42% of urban households, and it can be used as an extra indicator in educational variables (supply side). It is possible that when education was conducted in a hybrid method, children from marginalized communities were excluded from the scope of learning, resulting in significant learning loss that would damage lifelong skills, capabilities, functioning, and well-being as education strengthens these aspects (Sen, 1999).

Findings and Discussion

The educational participation of children is determined by both supply and demand factors. The supply side element refers to the availability or unavailability of schools in their immediate proximity, the quality of school infrastructure or bad quality, or teacher attitude, however, the demand side is mostly determined by household factors. Households determine the demand for education, which is influenced by factors such as poverty, a lack of understanding about the long-

term benefits of education, and a lack of trust in public education. In actuality, both of the constraints above are significant impediments to obtaining education. Different studies found that there is a supply-side factor that has a profound impact on children's regularity and retention in schools (Chugh, 2020; Bararjee, 2000). Consider these elements interwoven, and imagine how complicated the education of migrant children becomes.

The findings of the study present significant trends in gauging the educational status of migrant children.

First, there is a demand for education among migrant households however private schools are aspirational and motivational. Parents and households make decisions about whether to send their children or not to schools and they make their decision based on what they think is more valuable for instance to choose private or government school. To understand this trend an attempt has been made to find any relation and impact between parents' income on the educational status of migrant children living in the selected cluster. 45.24% of the migrant households can earn 20000-40000 rupees a month and it can be one of the variabilities of affordability associated with social status. However, there is a predominant notion about the poor teaching-learning process in government schools leading to non-satisfaction among poor households. The parents of the migrant children are not considered important stakeholders in the public education system. Such experience shapes their belief system and reduces faith in the government schooling system. It develops distrust of government schools as a site of learning cannot provide holistic development to children, especially in the age group between 6-14. These two are the main factors behind the rise in demand for private schooling. The low-cost private schools have successfully built the narrative that they provide education in English medium leading to better job opportunities in the future. The migrant parents seem convinced enough and ready to provide the best learning environment for their children.

Second, the findings suggest that the children of migrant households are also getting private tuition leading to additional costs of education. The parents of the households are engaged in temporary, insecure, irregular employment of nature which makes their livelihood fragile. Both parents are involved in work to bring more income to the family. This entire scenario significantly impacts the home support for the children, especially the availability of the space for home support. It is critical to note that the findings suggest that most of the migrant parents are less educated are attributed to first-generation and there is less parental support at home. These children are first generation learners, requiring more assistance and support to move ahead in education leading to private tutoring. It suggests that all the migrant households are committed to the education of their children and want a more conducive environment and more learning hours prompting a high demand for private tutoring.

Third, only a few are enrolled in government schooling and the reason to choose government schools is free education and scholarships. Despite the policies to provide midday meals, free textbooks, and uniforms to all the children from 6-14 years of age. None of the children are getting all of these in schools. The parents have to spend money on food, school uniforms, need-based stationery, and textbooks from their hard-earned money at the cost of other essential expenses and this could also be the reason that if they have to spend on so many things they can spend some amount on school fees and get them enrolled in private school. Low-cost private schools are idealised by a better teaching-

learning process by the marginalised population. One of the households has reported that the child was denied admission to government schools. The children, the parents, and the community also negotiate with the systems of education regularly and that is why they have their own experiences and shape their perception of education, leading to private education.

Fourth, migrant parents who send their children to government schools have never attended parent-teacher meetings. However, the finding further reveals that 2 out of 3 parents who send their children to government schools have information about parent-teacher meetings. The majority of the parents who send their children to private schools have information about parent-teacher meetings. Most of the parents have attended parent-teacher meetings at least once and sent their children to private schools. After school, the children spend most of their time at home, and parents' regular involvement is essential for the holistic development of the children. It also recognizes the agency and voice of the migrant parents who are concerned about the future of their children.

The varied approach of educational policies to quality improvement has been heavily criticized since it tends to overlook urban impoverished, separated, and marginalised populations in the long term. Children from specific areas and lower socioeconomic families have a very difficult time in school and outdoors. To completely realize an individual's potential, the children must be supported by an encouraging and receptive atmosphere. The difference between mainstream society and marginalised groups is a lack of access to a conducive environment and parental support, which prevents them from reaching their full potential. In the face of such marginalisation and social and economic depravity, compulsory education is striving to find its essence and value (Kumar, 2022). Childhood as a social category has been ignored and every child cannot be monitored from the same social lens as an intersection of income, parental education, and migrant status play important roles in the socialization of children.

Conclusion

The primary objective of this report is to assess the educational status of migrant children living in one of the clusters of Noida. Despite these existing vulnerabilities, most of the urban migrant families understand the importance of education and spend major parts of their income on private education. The question remains valid as to the extent to which the education system provides a level playing field to these marginalised children. The children of the deprived section do not have an equal head start, home support, and conducive environment as others due to poverty and lesser educated adults in the family. The environment at home and its surroundings are not favourable and conducive to education due to overlapping categories of social, educational, and economic marginalization. The study also showed that migrant households favoured sending their children to private tuition and private schools as compared to government schools. In this scenario, if the government schools fail to provide basic minimum infrastructure and motivated, trained, and sensitive teachers, it is required that the children remain in the schooling system. To overcome such challenges, it is quintessential for all the stakeholders to come together and address issues of home learning support and sensitization on education. In the absence of these aspects, education for all and universalization of education envisioned in much-celebrated RTE, 2009, Samagra Shiksha and Sustainable Development Goals 4 will most likely remain unachievable. The effectiveness of the Right to Education Act and the entire education system lies in the fact that the children realise their full

potential, which can best be summarised as the right to be taught and the right to learn.

References

- Aggarwal, Y.P. and Chugh, S. (2003). Learning Achievement of Slum Children in Government Schools NIEPA Occasional Paper 34, Retrieved <http://www.niepa.ac.in/download/Publications/Occasional%20Paper-34schugh.pdf>.
- Ainsworth, M. Beegle, K. and Koda, G. (2005). The Impact of Adult Mortality and Parental Deaths on Primary Schooling in North-Western Tanzania, *The Journal of Developmental Studies*, 41 (3), DOI: doi/abs/10.1080/0022038042000313318.
- Al-Samarrai, S. and Peasgood, T. (1998). Educational attainments and household characteristics in Tanzania, *Economics of Education Review*, Elsevier, vol. 17(4), pages 395-417, October. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/eoedu/v17y1998i4p395-417.html>.
- Awasthi, D. Kashyap, S.P. and Yagnik, J. (2009). Changing Sectoral Profile of the Urban Economy and Implications for Urban India, *Urban Poverty Report*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Bryk, D.C., S. A. and Thum, Y. M. (1989). The Effects of High School Organization on Dropping Out: An Exploratory Investigation. *American Educational Research Journal* 26(3).
- Chugh, S.(2020). Right to Education and Universal Participation of Children Living in Slums Issues, Gaps and Challenges, Occasional Paper No 54 NIEPA, New Delhi.
- Chugh, S. (2011). Dropout in Secondary Education: A study of Children Living in Slums of Delhi, NIEPA Occasional Paper-37, New Delhi City Development Plan (2010-30).
- Ersado, L. (2005). Child Labour and Schooling Decision in Urban and Rural Areas: Comparative Evidence from Nepal, Peru and Zimbabwe, *World Development*, 33(3).
- Kingdon, G.G. (2017). The Private Schooling Phenomenon in India: A Review. I Z A Institute of Labour Economics. Discussion Paper Series.
- Kumar, K. (2022). Smaller Citizens: writing on the making of Indian citizens. Orient BlackSwan.
- Rukmini, B. (2000). Poverty and Primary Schooling: Field Studies from Mumbai and Delhi, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 35, No. 10 (Mar. 4-10, 2000), pp. 795-802.
- NCEUS (2007). Conditions of Work and Promotion of Livelihoods in the Unorganised Sector New Delhi: National Commission on Enterprises in the Unorganised Sector, Government of India.
- NSSO 75th, Household Social Consumption on Education in India (2017-18)
- Ramchandran, V. (2012). Can rights Go Wrong? The RTE Conundrum in India, *India International Centre Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp-56-63.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Tilak, J. B. G. (1996). How Free is 'Free' Primary Education in India? *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 31, Issue No. 5, 03 Feb, 1996.
- Tooley, J. & Dixon, P. (2007). De facto privatization of education and the poor: implications of a study from sub-Saharan Africa and India. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*. Volume 36, 2006- Issue 4
- Tsujita, Y. (2009). Deprivation of Education: A Study of Slum Children in Delhi, India. Background paper for Education For All Global Monitoring Report, 2010 in PwC (eds) 'Forgotten Voice the World of Urban Children in India (2015).

Appendix

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TOPIC- Study project on the social, economic and educational status of the children of migrant labourers in Noida, Uttar Pradesh.

FORM NO.

1. Information of respondents

S.no	Question	Name/ Word	Code
1	District		
2	Block		
3	Village/ Sector		
4	Locality		
5	Name of Respondents (Code)		
6	Sex 1. M, 2. F		
7	Religion		
8	Caste		
9	Category		
10	Name of head of Family		
11	Relation with HOF (code)		
12	Household number		
13	Respondent's mobile number		
14	Respondent's WhatsApp number		
15	Date of Interview		
16	Time of beginning of Interview		
17	Time of end of interview		
18	Interviewer's Name		
19s	Interviewer's mobile number		

Code: (7) Religion- 1. Hindu; 2. Muslim; 3. Sikh; 4. Christian; 5.

Jain; 6. Buddhist; 7. Others (specify)

(9) Category- 1. General; 2. OBC; 3. EBC; 4. SC; 5. ST

(10) Name of head of family-

1 Relations of the respondents with the HOF

1-Self; 2- Husband; 3- Wife; 4- Son; 5- Daughter; 6-
Father-in- Law; 7- Mother-in-Law; 8- Any other
(Specify)

2. Family Profile

All the members of the respondent's kitchen are to be counted as his family members

Code: (3) Relations of the respondents with the HOF

1- Self; 2- Husband; 3- Wife; 4- Son; 5- Daughter; 6- Father-in-Law; 7- Mother-in-Law; 8- Any other (Specify)

(5) Sex- 1. Male; 2. Female

(6) Marital Status- 1. Married; 2. Unmarried; 3. Divorced; 4. Separated; 5. Widow/Widower

(7) Working Status- 1. Employed; 2. Unemployed;
3. Seasonal worker; 4. Homemaker; 5. Student; 6.
Others (specify)

(8) Occupation- 1. White collar factory worker; 2. Skilled labour; 3. Semi-skilled labour; 4. Unskilled labour; 5. Garage mechanic; 6. House help; 7. Rickshaw/Thella puller; 8. Contractor; 9. Maison; 10. Semi- skilled construction; 11. Unskilled construction labour; 12. Vendor; 13. General shop labour; 14. Tailor; 15. Artisan; 16. Driver; 17. Carpenter; 18. Plumber; 19. Parlor worker; 20. Others (specify)

(9) Hobby- 1. Cooking; 2. Singing; 3. Dancing; 4. Tailoring; 5. Beautician; 6. Writing; 7. Gaming; 8. Painting; 9. Net surfing; 10. Others (specify)

(10) Education- 1. Illiterate; 2. 1- 5th pass; 3. 6-8th pass; 4. 8-10th pass; 5. 10 – 12th; 6. Graduate; 7. Post-graduate; 8. Professional/ technical degree; 9. Play school; 10. Others (specify)

(13) Aadhar card- 1. Yes; 5. No

(14) Voter ID- 1. Yes; 5. No

3. Migration

3.1 Which community do you belong to?

(Use the code given below to fill up the answer)

1. Assamese; 2. Bengali; 3. Bihari; 4. Odia; 5. UP; 6. Jharkhand; 7. MP; 8. Gujarati; 9. Marathi; 10. Others (specify)

3.2 Where did you migrate from?

State

District.....

3.3 When did you migrate? year month

3.4 Did you emigrate further or return home thereafter? (fill the code in the boxes given below)

Yes- 1

no- 5

3.5 If yes, where else?

3.6 How often do you go back to your native place?

3.7 Details of work

Family ID	Name of workplace	Location of workplace	Monthly salary	Working hour	Distance from residence	Mode of transportation	Travel cost

Take Family ID reference from 2nd question on Family profile

4. Loans and savings

- 4.1 What is the family income monthly? a. 1,000-5,000
b. 5,000-10,000
c. 10,000-20,000
d. 20,000-40,000
e. More than 40,000

- 4.2 Was your family able to save over the last month? (Fill the code in the following boxes given below)
 Yes- 1
 No-5
- 4.3 If not, state the reason.
- 4.4 If yes, where did you save the money?
 1- Home (piggybank/ box) 2- Bank; 3- post office; 4- SHG; 5- Money lender; 6- any other (specify)
- 4.5 Have you ever taken a loan? (Fill the code in the following boxes given below)
 Yes- 1
 No- 5
- 4.6 If yes, from whom?
 1. Bank; 2- Relative; 3- money lender; 4- friend
- 4.7 If from a money lender, then rate of interest per month? 1. 1-4%; 2.
 4-8%; 3. 8-12%; 4. More than 12%
- 4.8 Was the loan repaid? (Fill the code in the following boxes given below) 1- Yes
 5- no
- 4.9 For what purpose the loan was taken?
 1. For livelihood; 2. For treatment 3. To return back other loans; 4.
 For remittance; 5. For dowry; 6. For education; 7. Others (specify)

5 Residential Status

- a. Is this your own house or rented? Yes-1
 No-5
- b. For how long have you been living in this house?
- c. For how long have you been living in this sector?
- d. About your house

Particulars	At Home
a) No. of rooms	
b) Separate Kitchen	
c) Separate Bathroom	
d) Present Price (if own)	
e) Electricity	

f) Source of Water	
g) Availability of water	
h) Availability of drinking water	
i) Kind of Latrine	
j) Dumping of garbage	
k) Collection of dustbins by Noida Development authority	

Code:

b) Separate Kitchen- 1. Yes; 5. No

c) Separate Bathroom- 1. Yes; 5. No

f) Source of water: 1- Tap; 2- Tube well; 3- Well, 4-Hand pump; 5- others (specify)

g) Availability of water: 1- Sufficient; 2- not sufficient due to long queue; 3- only for a short period; 4- not sufficient utensils to stock water; 5- not sufficient people in the family to collect water; 6- low pressure of water; 7- generally very far to go far water; 8- others.

i) Kind of latrines: 1- Septic; 2- Pit; 3- Sulabh type; 4- combined latrine; 5- open place; 6- others.

j) Garbage dumping: 1- In the dustbin of Noida Development authority; 2- in the street; 3- just in front of the house; 4- others.

k) Collection of dustbins: 1- daily; 2- twice a week; 3- once a week; 4- not regular; 5- Never.

6 Household accessories:

(Use the code given below to fill the boxes)

Particulars	Items
Tv	
Refrigerator	
Electric iron	
Pressure cooker	
LPG cylinder	
Bed	
Chair/ table	
Almirah	
Scooty	
Bike	
Car	
Cycle	
Mixer Grinder	
Cooler	
Smart Phone	

Computer	
Laptop	
I pad	
Sewing machine	

Code:

Yes- 1

No- 5

7 Child Profile

7.1 Do you know the Right to Education act (2009)? With reference to free and compulsory education for children between the age of 6-14 years. Yes- 1

No- 5

7.2 Have you benefited from the RTE? (use the code to fill in the box)

Yes-1

No-5

7.3 What kind of benefits did you get from RTE?

7.4 Which type of school does your child study in? (use the code to fill in the box)

1. Government School

2. Private School

7.5 Why did you get your child enrolled in a government school? (more than one code is applicable to be filled in the box)

a. Fee education

b. Mid-day meal

c. Free books

d. Free uniform

e. Scholarship

f. Better teachers

g. Other (specify)

7.6 Details of children who are enrolled in government school

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Family ID	Enrolled in School	Level of education	Medium of School	Type of School	Classes taught in school	Distance from residence to school	Mode of transportation	Facilities	Extra-curricular activities

Take reference of ID profile to be collected from 2nd question on the family code-

3. Level of education- 1. I; 2. II; 3. III; 4. IV; 5. V; 6. VI; 7. VII; 8. VIII; 9. IX; 10. X; 11. XI; 12. XII
4. Medium of education- 1. Hindi; 2. English; 3. Any other (specify)
5. Type of School- 1. Pre- primary; 2. Anganwadi; 3. Middle school; 4. High school
6. Classes taught in school- 1. I; 2. II; 3. III; 4. IV; 5. V; 6. VI; 7. VII; 8. VIII; 9. IX; 10. X; 11. XI; 12. XII
8. Mode of transportation- 1. On foot; 2. By bi-cycle; 3. Motor bike; 4. Four-wheeler; 5. Taxi; 6. Public vehicle; 7. Bus.
9. Facilities- 1. Electricity; 2. Drinking Water; 3. Books; 4. Uniform; 5. Washrooms
10. Extra- curricular activities- 1. Dance; 2. Drama; 3. Music; 4. Cricket; 5. Basketball; 6. Football; 7. Others (specify)

7.7 How many months does your child attend the school in a year? (use the code to fill in the box)

- a. 1-3 months
- b. 6 months
- c. 9 months
- d. Rarely
- e. Never

7.8 What are the reasons behind the child being regular at school? (more than one code is applicable to be filled in the box)

- a. Fee education
- b. Mid-day meal
- c. Free books
- d. Free uniform
- e. Scholarship
- f. Better teachers
- g. Other (specify)

- 7.9 Has the school ever given information about the absence of the student via telephone/ message? (use the code to fill in the box)
- Yes-1
No-5
- 7.10 Are you satisfied by the teaching-learning method of the school? (use the code to fill in the box)
- Yes-1
No-5
- 7.11 What are the salient features of the method of teaching in school? (more than one code is applicable to fill in the box)
- a. Behaviour of the teacher
b. Simple Textbooks
c. Opportunities to play
d. Peer learning
e. Healthy Competition
f. Others (specify)
- 7.12 Are the textbooks free at the school? (use the code to fill in the box)
- Yes-1
No-5
- 7.13 Is the uniform provided by the school? (use the code to fill in the box)
- Yes-1
No-5
- 7.14 Is scholarship given to the students? (use the code to fill in the box)
- Yes-1
No-5
- 7.15 Are mid-day meals provided by the school? (use the code to fill in the box)
- Yes-1
No-5
- 7.16 Are you aware of the parent teacher meeting conducted in the school? (use the code to fill in the boxes)
- Yes- 1
No- 5
- 7.17 If yes, do you attend the PTM? (use the code to fill in the boxes)
- Yes- 1
No- 5

7.18 How often do you attend the PTM? (Use the code to fill in the box)

- a. Every month
- b. Every 6 months;
- c. Sometimes;
- d. Never

PRIVATE SCHOOL

7.19 Details of children who are enrolled in private schools

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Family ID	Enrolled in School	Level of education	Medium of School	Type of School	Classes taught in school	Distance from residence to school	Mode of transportation

Take reference of Family ID from the 2nd question on the family profile. Code:

3. Level of education- 1. I; 2. II; 3. III; 4. IV; 5. V; 6. VI; 7. VII; 8. VIII; 9. IX; 10. X; 11. XI; 12. XII

4. Medium of education- 1. Hindi; 2. English; 3. Any other (specify)

5. Type of School- 1. Pre- primary; 2. Anganwadi; 3. Middle school; 4. High school

6. Classes taught in school- 1. I; 2. II; 3. III; 4. IV; 5. V; 6. VI; 7. VII; 8. VIII; 9. IX; 10. X; 11. XI; 12. XII

8. Mode of transportation- 1. On foot; 2. By bi-cycle; 3. Motor bike; 4. Four- wheeler; 5. Taxi; 6. Public vehicle; 7. Bus.

7.20 Expense of facilities provided by private school

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Family ID	School Fee (monthly)	Uniform	Books	Stationery	Mode of transportation (monthly)	Additional Cost for Extracurricular activities

For reference, take Family ID from the 2nd question on the family profile. Code:

(6) Mode of transportation- 1. On foot; 2. By bi-cycle; 3. Motor bike; 4. Four- wheeler; 5. Taxi; 6. Public vehicle; 7. Bus.

(7) Extra- curricular activities- 1. Dance; 2. Drama; 3. Music; 4. Cricket; 5. Basketball; 6. Football; 7. Others (specify)

7.21 How many months does your child attend the school in a year? (use the code to fill in the box)

- a. 1-3 months
- b. 6 months
- c. 9 months
- d. Rarely
- e. Never

7.22 What are the reasons behind the child for being regular at school? (more than one code is applicable to be filled in the box)

- a. Behaviour of the teacher
- b. Better quality of teaching
- c. A good friend
- d. Facilities to play
- e. Others (specify)

7.23 Has the school ever given information about the absence of the student via telephone/ message? (use the code to fill in the box)

Yes-1

No-5

7.24 Are you satisfied by the teaching-learning method of the school? (use the code to fill in the box)

Yes-1

No-5

7.25 What are the salient features of the method of teaching in school? (more than one code is applicable to fill in the box)

- a. Behaviour of the teacher
- b. Simple textbooks
- c. Opportunity to play
- d. Peer learning
- e. Healthy Competition
- f. Others (specify)

7.26 Are you aware of the parent teacher meeting conducted in the school? (use the code to fill in the boxes)

Yes- 1

No- 5

7.27 If yes, do you attend the PTM? (use the code to fill in the boxes)

Yes- 1

No- 5

7.28 How often do you attend the PTM? (Use the code to fill in the box)

- a. Every month
- b. Every 6 months
- c. Sometimes
- d. Never

7.29 Which subject is most interesting for your child?

Family ID	Subject

#use family ID from the 2nd question on the family profile.

Code- (code provided below has to be used to fill in the columns)

(2) Subject- 1. Maths; 2. Science; 3. Social science; 4. Environmental science; 5.

Hindi; 6. English; 7. Others (specify)

8. Tuition

- 8.1 Has your child been enrolled in tuition?
(Fill the code in the boxes given below)

Yes - 1

No – 5

- 8.2 What are the factors behind a child enrolling in tuition? (more than one code is applicable to fill in the box)

- a. Homework
- b. Poor in English
- c. Poor in Maths
- d. Uneducated parents
- e. Others (specify)

- 8.3 Details of private tuitions-

Family ID	Tuition timings	Type of Tuition (Home tuition/ online tuition/ coaching)	Tuition fee	Mode of transportation	Subjects taught (fill the code given below)

For reference, use Family ID taken from the 2nd question on the family profile.

Code: Subjects taught- 1. English; 2. Hindi; 3. Maths; 4. Social science; 5. Science; 6. Others (specify)

- 8.4 If they take coaching, what are the facilities provided?

Coaching facilities

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
No. of teachers	Classes	Subjects Taught	Classroom	Capacity of one classroom	Black board	Drinking water	Study material	Electricity	Internet

For reference, take the family ID from the 2nd question on the family profile.

Code: (2) Classes- - 1. I; 2. II; 3. III; 4. IV; 5. V; 6. VI; 7. VII; 8. VIII; 9. IX; 10. X; 11. XI; 12. XII

(3) Subjects taught- 1. Hindi; 2. English; 3. Maths; 4. Science; 5. Social Science; 6. Others (specify)

8.5 Is there a child who has not enrolled in a private / government school between the age group of 6-14? (use the code to fill the box)

Yes-1

No-5

8.6 If yes, what are the reasons behind it? (more than one code is applicable to fill the box)

a. Absence of information about free education

b. Far distance of government school

c. Child labour

d. Low income

e. Inability to pay school fee

f. Other (specify)

8.7 Is there anyone from the household between the age of 6-14 years who has dropped out of school? (use the code to fill the box)

Yes-1

No-5

8.8 Details of children who have dropped out of school.

Family ID	Sex	Reason to drop out of school

Code-

(2) Sex: Male-1; Female-2

9. Government Scheme

(use the code to fill in the boxes given below)

S. no	Government Scheme List	Use of this scheme by family members (code: 1 - 5)	When did you get the benefit of this scheme recently? (MM/YY)	What benefits did you get from this scheme? (Cash/ Kind)
1	Anganwadi			
2	Janani Suraksha Yojana			
3	Mid- day meal			
4	Pradhan Mantri Jandhan Yojna			
5	Self- help group			
6	Ration card			
7	Ayushman Bharat Yojana (Swasth)			
8	Ujjwala Yojana			
9	Vridha Pension (Old age pension)			
10	Vidhwa Pension			
11	Any other (specify)			

10. Information and technology

10.1 Does anyone in your family have the capability of browsing the internet?
(use the code to fill the box)

Yes-1

No-5

10.2 If yes, could you share the Family ID of those who are well- versed with the internet?

S. no.	Family ID

Take reference of Family ID from the 2nd question on Family profile.

10.3 What technology is available at your house? (use the code to fill in the boxes given below)

Name of Technology	Answer Nothing- 0 Yes- 1 No- 5		
Mobile phone			
Smart phone			
Tablet			
Laptop			
Desktop			

Multiple options can be selected from “name of Technology Column” in 10.3.

10.4 For what reason did you use the internet?

Yes- 1

No-5

Reasons	ANSWER
Application for Government Scheme	
To contact relatives/ friends	
Banking	
Railway tickets	
Electricity Bill	
Mobile recharge	

Gas Bill	
Education information	
Any other (specify)	

10.5 Which all family members of the house are able to use the above technology?

Yes-1

No-5

Name of Technology	Family ID
Mobile phone	
Smart phone	
Tablet	
Laptop	
Desktop	

#For reference, use Family ID from the 2nd question on the family profile.

10.6 Is there anyone in your household who is willing to learn about digital technology? (Fill the Code in the boxes given below)

Yes- 1

No- 5

Respondent's Signature

