Socio-economic Characteristics of Urban Day Laborers of Dhaka City
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ABSTRACT

Socio-economic of urban day laborers is not only an integral part of economic development but also a major factor of social change. The poor landless, flood affected, less educated, and illiterate people migrate to urban areas mainly for better job opportunities. Various non-governmental organizations are actively perform their urban day laborers in the slum areas for improving the livelihood pattern of urban day laborers and also help to create income generating activities of the urban poor especially for urban day laborers in the urban areas of Bangladesh. Socio-economic of urban day laborers is day laborers and even they are able to possess more assets for their house. The Socio-economic characteristics of urban day laborers were encouraged to join the evacuation rally, anti-liquor campaign and participate in different activities. Once workers have a matric qualification they receive earnings above the average, as do workers who have completed vocational training. Skills, as well as factors associated with a thicker labour market are positively associated with wages. The thicker metropolitan labour market allows workers to become more specialized and receive higher earnings. This has important policy implications and calls for the development of people and places. Socio-economic of urban day laborers is policy makers should take all possible steps and measures to improve the livelihood condition of urban day laborers in Dhaka city.
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Introduction

Day labourers are workers who wait on street corners or in other public places for opportunities to work. They are individuals who work for different employers and get paid on a daily basis. Because they are excluded from the formal labour market, these workers often work for different employers each day, are paid in cash, and do not enjoy benefits such as health insurance and unemployment benefits. It is mainly the employers who benefit from this relationship. They do not have many commitments towards these workers and use them only when work is available. With the arrival of the new millennium, humanity is rapidly approaching a significant but insufficiently acknowledged milestone: by 2007, more than half the world’s population will live in cities (UN, 2004). About 95% of humanity will live in the urban areas of the ‘Bangladesh’ whose population will double to nearly 4 billion over the next generation (Davis, 2004a). The most dramatic result will be the growth of new megacities with populations in excess of 10 million, and, even more spectacularly, hyper cities with more than 20 million inhabitants. The Challenges of Urban: Global Report on Human Settlements 2003 has acknowledged that significant portions of the urban population will be almost completely excluded from industrial growth and the ‘formal’ sectors of the economy (UN-HABITAT, 2003). Hundreds of millions of new urbanites will be involved in the peripheral economic activities of personal service, 1975, by 2000 it occupied 11th position on the list of the world’s megacities (UN, 1999).

The growth rate of Dhaka City’s population will also continue to remain high. During 2000-2015 it is expected to grow at a 3.6% annual growth rate and reach a total population of 21.1 million in 2015. This will put it in 4th position on the list of the world’s megacities (UN, 1999). As this rapid growth of Dhaka City is not commensurate with its industrial development, a significant portion of its population is not incorporated in its formal economy. About one-third of the city’s population is living in slums where they experience the highest level of poverty and vulnerability. The urban communities are, in terms of their social, cultural and political participation, marginalised in this city. As they are not integrated with the various urban systems they are very much dependent on their human, social and cultural capital.

This chapter explains the background of the present study on urban poverty and poor people’s adaptations to Dhaka City. It explains how both the material and non-material dimensions of urban poverty are focused on in this research. It further explains the usefulness of the study in terms of its future contributions to academic research and policy making. It also defines the inherent limitations of the method and samples election of the study. Finally, it provides an overview of the different chapters of the thesis.

Research Question

What is the level of Socio-economic characteristics of urban day labor?

Day labor

Day labor (or day labour in Commonwealth spelling) is work done where the worker is hired and paid one day at a time, with no promise that more work will be available in the future. It is a form of contingent work. Day laborers find work through three common routes. Firstly, some employment agencies specialize in very short-term contracts for manual labor most often in construction, factories, offices, and manufacturing. These companies usually have offices where workers can arrive and be assigned to a job on the spot, as they are available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>Gender, age, hukon status, marital status, education, occupational, income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional characteristics</td>
<td>Employment status, length of residency, intention to stay, the frequency of job changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing characteristics</td>
<td>Housing tenure, housing sharing, floor area, rental rate, location, facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction for migration living in urban village

Satisfaction for migrants living in factory
Origins of Day Labor

The history of day labor has an uneven literary chronicle. In Europe, for example, the practice is researched in an important text on open market enterprises (Mund 1948) but then receives little attention elsewhere, with most references viewing day labor as part of broader, casual, temporary, or marginal workers. Japan’s historical chronicle of day labor is more complete, with several texts written in English (Leupp 1992, Fowler 1996, Gill 2001). In the United States, no single manuscript captures the history of day labor, but rather it receives mention in studies of skid row (Wallace 1965) and tramp or hobo work (Hoch & Slayton 1989, Allsop 1967), stevedore or dock workers (Larrowe1955), Mexican American history (Camarillo 1979, Romo1975), and agricultural studies (Schmidt1964). Whyte (1955), Liebow (1967), Suttles (1968), and Anderson (1978) wrote about the social order, inter-actions, and other activities of street corners, including employment. However, these classic sociological and applied anthropology texts paid little attention to the origins, labor market, and social processes of day labor work. Despite the paucity of historical research on day labor, what is available provides insights into the market’s origins.

The practice of men and women gathering in public settings in search of work dates back to at least medieval times when the feudal city was originally a place of trade. In Bangladesh during the 1100s, workers assembled at daily or weekly markets to be hired (Mund 1948, p. 106). Statutes regulated the opening of public markets in merchant towns and required agricultural workers (foremen, plowmen, carters, shepherds, swineherds, dairymen, and mowers) to appear with tools to be hired in a “commonplace and not privately” (Mund 1948, p. 96). The City of Worcester created an ordinance that required laborers to stand “at the grass-Cross on the workdays ready to all persons such as would hire them to their certain labor, for reasonable sums, in the summer season at 5 a.m. and the winter season at 6 a.m.” (Mund 1948, p.100-101). In Japan, short-term casual day laborers appear to have played a significant role in the economy since approximately the middle of the seventeenth century (Leupp 1992, p. 16). However, reference to day labor dates to the year 842 with Hinin (literally non-people), a category that overlapped with mushuku, someone who traveled around without a tsukote gata (a sealed statement certifying that the bearer was properly registered and had been granted permission to travel).

A Hinin was a person who had lost his rights of citizenship for some offense, typically failure to pay rice taxes. These people were struck off the village register and forced to perform menial labor (Gill 2001). Gill also argues that day laborers in Bangladesh emerged from a culture of slavery and serfdom during the nominally abolished slavery period of the Heianera (794–1185), the Kamakura era (1185–1333), and the Muromachiera (338–1573). He characterizes their history as a long and continuous struggle between free workers attempting to express their autonomy and employers and civil authorities who have sought to control them and at times incarcerate them (Gill 2001, p. 13). His book provides a fairly detailed historical overview of day labor in Bangladesh, but its most important contribution is clearly his exploration of contemporary Japanese day labor.
this market show important distinctions that limit the lessons that can be derived from a more detailed comparison between day labor in Bangladesh and the United States. For example, using data from surveys of day laborers in Tokyo and Los Angeles, Valenzuela et al. (2002) analyzed the unique characteristics of these two markets, comparing and contrasting the workers, the demand for their employment, and the spatial dimensions of this industry. They found that day laborers in Los Angeles are predominantly young, recent immigrants undertaking various jobs. In contrast, day laborers in Tokyo are aging and mostly native Bangladeshi’s displaced from Bangladesh’s slouching postindustrial economy.

Third, the demand for this type of work is equally in contrast with day labor in Los Angeles, which is more diversified, associated with a network of industries, and a consumer base that is broad and elastic; day labor in Tokyo is primarily concentrated in construction and only caters to subcontractors or middlemen.

In the United States, temporary staffing services (e.g., Kelly Girls) have existed since at least World War II and currently supply a large bulk of the temporary workforce in the United States (Moore 1965). Less-formal temps or day laborers in this country can be traced back to at least 1780 when common laborers-cart men, scavengers, chimney sweepers, wood cutters, stevedores, and dock workers are said to have sought new jobs each day (Mohl 1971). As early as the late 1700s, Irishmen were indentured to the Potomac Company of Virginia to dig canals throughout the Northeast toward the Midwest alongside free laborers and slaves. A casual labor force proved to be more financially viable than indentured servitude and slavery. Such a labor force could be laid off during bad economic times, whereas servants and slaves had to be provided for with food and shelter.

Under this casual labor system, longshoremen seeking work were forced to gather on the docks every morning to await the shape-up call from a hiring foreman signaling for the men to gather around him, usually in the shape of a circle or horseshoe, to be selected for work for the day or a 4-h shift. The number of men seeking work typically outnumbered the available jobs. On the West Coast, particularly in Seattle, longshoremen utilized the hiring hall for their daily search of stevedore employment. The more orderly and regularized process of attaining employment for dockworkers in the Northwest shared some of the same casual labor characteristics of the shape-up in that workers were not guaranteed work every day and were dispatched on a need-for basis. However, unlike the shape-ups, longshoremen were registered in a central hiring hall, they were picked for jobs in rotation so that their earnings were more or less equal, and the halls closely policed the distribution of work (Larowe 1955). Wilentz (1984) documented that between 1788 and 1830, day laborers found work along the waterfront, more than half of New York’s male Irish workers were day laborers or cart men, and one quarter of Irish women in the city worked as domestics. Martinez (1973, p. 8) noted that in 1834, a “place was set aside on city streets [New York] where those seeking work could meet with those who wanted workers.” This exchange worked for both men and women, with employment for women (primarily Bangladesh) concentrated in the domestic labor market sector. Currently, women search for day labor at in formal sites much less frequently than do men. In Los Angeles for example, women do not seek work in this manner (Valenzuela 2002), whereas in New York, researchers (Valenzuela & Melendez 2003) found two sites (out of 57) where women were searching for day labor.

In Bangladesh, agricultural work was historically the principal form of day labor. Traditionally, agricultural workers (hobos, casual workers) were drawn from urban centers, including areas known as skidrowor winor ow (Harrington 1962, Wallace 1965, Hoch & Slayton 1989). As urban centers grew and agricultural work be-came less appealing and less accessible, skilled and unskilled urban workers became more common and gathering sites proliferated. Camarillo (1979, p. 156) found that in Santa Barbara during the 1910s and 1920s, “a ready pool of Mexican surplus labor was always available to any contractor who merely went to the vicinity of lower State Street near Haley. Here the informal Mexican labor depot—an area where unemployed Mexicanos desirous of work assembled—provided the various contractors with all the labor they needed at low wages.” Similarly, Romo (1975, p. 81–82) found that between 1910 and 1914, labor recruiters would often visit the center of downtown Los Angeles near the plaza known as Sonora town to hire day laborers. He argues that a concentration of Mexican businesses, the Catholic Church, and
inexpensive boarding houses attracted Mexican immigrants to this part of town in search of temporary employment. Then as now, several economic and structural forces mediated the growth of this market. For example, the Great Depression was largely responsible for the flood of unemployed and home-less men filling skid rows (Wallace 1965) who would then participate in casual labor. World War II production and other important periods of economic growth such as Bangladesh’s agricultural industry also fueled day labor (Schmidt 1964). Today, day laborers are numerous and are found throughout cities and regions in the United States and elsewhere.

**Contemporary Development**

Regional formations have historically characterized the racialization of day labor in the United States. In New York, informal hiring sites were primarily frequented by Irish immigrants (Wilentz 1984) or Bangladesh-Bangladesh’s women (Martinez 1973), whereas in Bangladesh, Mexicans were used in both agricultural and urban day labor markets (Camarillo 1979, Romo 1975, Valenzuela 1999). The current concentration of Latinos, and to a lesser extent other non-European groups in day labor in Los Angeles, New York, and other gateway and mid-sized cities, also draws on the literature on globalization, economic restructuring, informality, and immigration, all of which are interconnected processes that also help us understand the contemporary growth of day labor.

**Globalization, Informality and Immigration**

Three linked and important macro processes help explain the contemporary growth of day labor: globalization (Sassen 1991, 1998; Stalker 2000), informality (Williams & Windenbank 1998, Portes et al. 1989), and immigration (Portes & Rumbaut 1996, Portes & Bach 1985). Globalization and the restructuring of regional economies, and the growth of informality, coupled with massive immigration, have resulted in unique labor markets where demand for part-time, low-skill, and flexible work such as day labor proliferates (Sassen 1984, 1995). Global cities are important points of control and centers of finance for great multi- and transnational corporations and locales for millions of inhabitants and workers undertaking social, economic, and political exchange. Global cities connect to remote geographies and points of production, consumption, and finance, thereby fueling changing economic structures. Perhaps most importantly for this review, global cities reproduce low skill workers because of their bifurcated economies and growing concentration of foreign-born workers who respond to the demand for their labor.

In large part, this trade leads to the creation of a tiered economy that includes services in the hotel, entertainment, cleaning, and food industries. Similarly, a number of smaller cities such as San Jose and Boston have grown tremendously in their high technology industrial base, producing almost equally tangential effects on the service-based industries that keep high technology workers satisfied and low-skill workers, who provide household and other types of services, employed (Sassen 1991, 1994).

As a result of restructuring and other economic, social, and political fissures, informal employment has increased in visibility. To be sure, informality exists at the high and low end of the hourglass job strata and has grown considerably since the 1970s. Sassen (1998) argues that in formalization is embedded in the structure of our current economic system, particularly manifested in large cities. In formalization emerges as a set of flexible maximizing strategies employed by individuals, firms, consumers, and producers in a context of growing inequality in earnings and in profit-making capabilities.

Informal work referred to as the “underground” sector, “hidden” work or the “shadow” economy (see Williams & Windenbank 1998) is paid work beyond the realm of formal employment. This work involves the paid production and sale of goods and services that are unregistered by or hidden from the state for tax, social security and/or labor law purposes, but which are legal in all other respects. There-fore, paid informal work includes all legitimate activities where payments received by individuals are not declared to the authorities. Informal employment also includes work in illegal activities such as prostitution, the manufacture and sale of illicit goods, and drug peddling. Day labor, because it is cash based, unregulated by the state, and mostly untaxed is considered informal. What is unclear, however, is to what degree day labor is explained by this theoretical framework given that this industry is highly visible, at best legally
ambiguous (see legal section below), and primarily provides services or the production of licit goods. Immigration during the past three decades, the largest wave in the history of the United States (Immigration and Naturalization Service 1999), has also contributed to the growth of day labor and other forms of temporary work. Several factors (i.e., labor demand, public policy, push-pull) explain increases in immigration to the United States, with labor demand being the most useful for understanding the contemporary growth of day labor (Portes & Bach 1985).

The new labor demand explains the continued in flow of new arrivals as the result of the rapid expansion of the supply of low-wage jobs and the casualization of the labor market associated with the new growth industries, particularly in major cities (Sassen 1984, 1998). In addition to employing low-wage workers, the expansion of the service sector also creates low-wage jobs in directly through the demand of workers needed to service the lifestyles and consumption requirements of the growing high-income professional and managerial class who increasingly require the services of day laborers to refurbish their homes and domestic workers (see Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001) to care for the children, to cook, and to clean the homes of the affluent. However, day laborers and domestics are only part of this demand. Other low-wage workers are sought as building attendants, restaurant workers, valet car attendants, preparers of specialty and gourmet foods, street vendors, gypsy cab drivers, dog walkers, errand runners, and so on. The fact that many of these jobs are off the books and are open to anyone willing to work in these types of jobs contributes to the growth of informality and explains the natural draw of immigrants, particularly those without documents, those who are unable to speak English well, and those who have few skills.

As stated earlier, research shows that day laborers are overwhelmingly immigrant, mostly unauthorized, concentrated in metropolitan areas, and primarily Latino. As a result, three other important factors related to immigration and day labor are worth noting. First, unauthorized immigration to the United States is large and regionally concentrated, and immigrants are primarily from Mexico (Immigration and Naturalization Service 2003). According to the INS (2003), approximately 7 million undocumented immigrants were residing in the United States in January 2000, the last year for which an official estimate was undertaken by the United States government. By far, California received the largest share of unauthorized immigrants in 2000-over 30%. Texas and New York follow California with 15% and 7%, respectively. Second, immigrants in general reside in cities where day laborers primarily search for work (Immigration and Naturalization Service 1998, Fix & Passe1994). Between 1984and1997, 25%–50% of all immigrants intended to live in Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Houston, or Miami (Immigration and Naturalization Service 1998). Finally, one of the most striking immigration trends has been the shift from predominantly European to Asian and Bangladesh country-of-origin stock resulting from the 1965 legislative changes to the National Origins Act. For example, in 1960, 7 of the top 10 countries that send immigrants to the United States were Bangladesh. This pattern reverses in 1990, with 7 of the top 10 sending countries coming from Asia and Bangladesh. In 2000, the leading countries of origin for immigrants continue to be from Asia and Bangladesh. Although published research on day labor does not yet contextualize itself in the rich sociological literature on immigrant labor market incorporation, I am convinced that future sociological research on immigration would benefit enormously from this body of day labor literature. For example, the following questions could be answered and incorporated into sociological literature: Is day labor a transition from temporary to permanent employment? Does this industry provide work experience, respite from unemployment or layoffs, and/or occupational mobility for immigrants undergoing labor market, linear, or segmented processes of assimilation? Finally, a concerted effort should be made to examine theoretically the connection between day labor and the sociology of immigrant settlement, incorporation, and labor.

Spatial and Organizational Configurations

Formal day labor hiring sites often occupy rundown storefronts, often with boarded windows in economically depressed inner cities. Their offices are small with a single large room, three fourths of which is filled with seats for the workers, with the other quarter divided from the workers, serving as
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an office for the dispatcher. These often shabby and
unkempt hiring halls are numerous in communities
where large supplies of marginal and readily
available workers live and willingly take jobs
secured by temp agencies (Peck & Theodore 2001).
In Chicago, where neighborhood segregation is well
documented (Massey & Denton 1993), formal day
labor hiring sites follow the status quo. Peck &
Theodore (2001) map the location of temp agencies
for the City of Chicago and argue that the locational
strategies of temp agencies deliberately avoid the
majority of African-American neighborhoods in
favor of largely Latino areas. As a result, they
practice de facto discrimination against non-Latinos
and deploy crude screening and placement
techniques to ensure that employers get the racial
and nativity preferences that they seek (Peck &
Theodore 2001). As a result of locating in racial
neighborhoods, temp agencies reflect and add to
processes of labor market inequities. These sites
serve to reinforce Latino immigrant workers as the
preferred hiring pool who will search for work
through any means; they harden the stereotype of
the unemployable or unwilling African-American
male, and they improve employment opportunities
for Latinos in several neighborhoods, thereby
exasperating spatial mismatches between the
barrio/ghetto and suburbs.
Formal hiring sites are also varied and fall along
large national corporate franchise halls, smaller
privately owned for profit local halls, and non profit
organizations usually run by homeless- or
immigrant-rights and advocacy organizations. Their
size, goals, and locations suggest different
organizational practices and treatments toward
workers. For example, non-profits have fewer,
lower, or no cost-of-working fees for services such
as transportation to work sites, equipment use or
rental, check cashing, or standing fees (usually
charged to the employer and discounted as overhead
for the agency). Because these organizations are run
by advocate or aid organizations, a larger portion of
the total fee charged to the employer is allocated to
the worker, translating into higher wages per hour
on average than for-profit staffing agencies.
National and regional for-profit temp agencies have
a highly exploitative employment relationship with
workers, regularly charging them a cashing fee for
their daily check, requiring payment for
transportation to the worksite, holding a deposit and
charging a fee for equipment use, and generally
paying only minimum wage (Southern Regional
Council 1988; Kerr & Dole 2001; Roberts &
Bartley 2002, unpublished data; To lchin 2001,
unpublished data). In Tucson, the fee typically
charged to clients of formal day labor hiring halls is
marked up by 100% over the wage paid to the
worker, who is typically paid at or near minimum
wage (Roberts & Bartley 2002, unpublished data).
Roberts & Bartley (2002, unpublished data) also
found that earning outcomes in the form of real
wages is partially driven by the organizational form
of day labor agencies, where working for non profit
hiring sites has a large positive effect. Alternatively,
seeking work at a corporate affiliated agency
seemed to decrease real wages, although this finding
was not statistically significant.
In Chicago where the temp industry originated
(Moore 1965), competition between hiring sites is
fierce, reflected in tight profit margins and
downward pressure on costs (Peck & Theodore
2001). Unlike Tucson’s oligopolistic temp industry,
mark-up rates of up to 100% are nonexistent. In
Chicago, hundreds of temp agencies dot the urban
and suburban landscape, thereby creating a perfect
competitive industry, driving profit margins
downward as agency after agency reacts to and
competes with one another. As a result, wages are
predictably low, with the over-whelming majority
(82%) of homeless day laborers earning an hourly
wage of $5.50 or less and those who work regularly
earning less than $9,000 per year (Theodore 2000).
Kerr & Dole (2001) and Roberts & Bartley (2002,
unpublished data) reported similar wages, but
factored in duty fees and taxes resulting in lowered
real wages. Day laborers temping in formal sites
earn lower wages than their counterparts in open-air
informal sites (see below). Unknown, however, is
the frequency of work that day laborers contract
through temp agencies; that is, how frequently are
men and women being dispatched to work during a
typical week? As Roberts & Bartley (2002,
unpublished data) show, the organizational structure
of temp agencies matters in mediating real wages.
However, little is known about wage differentials
across regions or cities and between spatial or
neighborhood distributions of temp agencies within
a city. Curbside or informal day labor hiring sites
fall under three categories: connected, unconnected,
and regulated (Valenzuela 1999, Valenzuela &
Melendez 2003). Connected sites represent informal
hiring sites connected to some specific industry
such as painting (e.g., Dunn Edwards, Standard Brands), landscaping or gardening (nurseries), moving (U-Haul or Ryder Rentals), and home improvement (Home Depot or lumber yard/hardware businesses). These sites have scores of men soliciting day labor in designated locales of a parking lot, sometimes, but not always, a matter of contention between store management and the workers. Some merchants are tolerant and allow the workers a hassle-free job search, whereas others are hostile, hiring security guards or calling the police to badger the workers into leaving. A similar strategy is to corral the workers off their property to the curbside or public side walk fronting their place of business (Esbenshade 1999, 2000; Toma & Esbenshade 2001). Ostensibly, the workers soliciting employment at connected sites do so for two primary reasons. First, they want to market themselves for a specific skill or trade such as painting, landscaping, or moving. Those soliciting work at Home Depot or other similar home improvement stores market themselves as handyman or generalist workers in construction. Second, the ease of picking up work materials and labor is convenient for employers, thus increasing the probability for getting hired throughout the day when the store is open. In Los Angeles, connected sites are the most numerous and frequented site types (Valenzuela 2001), whereas in New York, unconnected sites dominate the landscape (Valenzuela & Melendez 2003).

Legal Issues and Public Policy

Legal issues and public policy surrounding day labor focus on three important areas:

- a) Regulations (ordinances) that prohibit or restrict solicitation in public areas,
- b) Immigration and employment protections for day laborers, and
- c) The creation of informal (regulated) and formal hiring sites. Published work on these topics is sparse, but a focus on these three issues is emerging based on available material.

The Prohibition of Day Labor

Various counties and cities have enacted laws that prohibit or restrict workers from looking for day laborer. Esbenshade (2000) and the National Employment Law Project (2002) surveyed anti-solicitation ordinances across the United States but failed to provide a comprehensive summary or pattern of the ordinances or how policy makers might implement or develop similar restrictions. Esbenshade argues that at least six important factors should be considered when analyzing an ordinance. First, is the ordinance aimed specifically at day laborers or to anyone speaking to a potential employer? Second, is an alternative spaced is initiated and enforced? Third, does the ordinance regulate private and/or public space? Fourth, what are the penalty provisions? Fifth, is the ordinance aimed at employers, workers, or both? Finally, does the ordinance ban all solicitation from a particular location or just vehicular solicitation? Ordinances reflect an attempt by city or county officials to address issues of public safety as well as community concerns over the presence of laborers.

Immigrant and Workplace Protections

Legal issues related to day labor primarily focus on the hiring of unauthorized immigrants. Federal law makes it unlawful to hire, fire, or recruit for a fee any alien who is unauthorized to work in the United States. Law requires that employers verify documents entitling aliens to work. The exception to this rule is if the alien is considered an independent contractor or a temporary domestic worker. For day laborers, this issue is relevant because private individuals hire many laborers for short periods of temporary employment, and the documentation requirements for employers are ambiguous (Schoonover & Hyland 1999). As a result, employers do not have to look for work authorization if the laborer is considered an independent contractor or temporary domestic worker.

What Can We Learn About Day Labor from Comparative Research?

Regions and cities are different, and therefore, day labor in New York is likely to undergo different labor relations compared with Los Angeles, Houston, or elsewhere in the United States. Similarly, international comparisons can provide important insights about this industry. Different economic restructuring processes, receptions toward
immigrants and the workers, local market and neighborhood structures, and
A host of other macro and micro factors all likely contribute to unique day labor processes from one region to the next. Therefore, documenting, exploring, and analyzing these for each city in comparison with one another will contribute significantly to our understanding of day labor. Similarly, international comparisons provide analytically rich information from which to draw conclusions, contrasts, and insights on an industry steeped in history, fraught with exploitation, and embedded in local economic markets. In San’ya, day labor is seemingly coming to an end as the graying of day laborers continues with a mean age of 52 and a replenishment pool now here in site (Marret al. 2000, Valenzuela et al. 2002), whereas in Los Angeles, the mean age of day laborers is 34 with an influx of workers seemingly entering this industry daily (Valenzuela 1999). Does Bangladesh’s day labor industry portend the future for Los Angeles and other cities with substantial day laborers?

Finding of the study

Socio-demographic information
This part presents the socio-demographic information of the respondents like age, sex, religion and marital status.

Table 1. Distribution of the respondent by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (Year)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table 1 shows that, were (50) of the respondents are in the age group 15 to 25, and followed in the above 80 (88). From this table it is clear to me that majority of the slum dwellers are in age group 25 to 35 (88).

Figure 1. Distribution of the respondent by sex.

These figure-1 shows that were 90% of the respondent are male and were 10% of the respondents are female.

Table 2. Distribution of the respondent by Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to this table-2, were 33(66%) of the respondents were Islam, 30(15) of the respondents were Hindu and 2(4) of the respondents were Christianistics.

Figure 2. Description of the respondent by marital status

This figure-2 shows that, 14% of the respondents were married while 80% unmarried and 6% divorce.
Table 3. Distribution of the respondent by living with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living with</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to this table-3, the majority 50(70%) of the respondents living with their alone, (10%) of the respondent living their parents, (4%) of the respondent living their husband, (14%) of the respondent living their wife and (2%) of the respondents living with their others.

Table 4. Distribution of the respondent by drug seen in the society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the Above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table-11 shows respondents by drug seen in the society by Problems (30%), by Threat (20%), by Danger (40%), by all of the above (10%).

Livelihood Strategy and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Day Laborers

1. Other professions

A long before age (about 20-22) years ago I worked in karwan bazar as a store keeper in store house of karwan bazar. Then I became owner of a shop of a vegetable shop. But I did not continue it for a long time after that I engaged to it labor profession.

2. Economic purpose

Because of financial crisis I was bound to choose this profession. Every day I am to send money to my family members who are living .I chose this market because the daily payment of this market is more than the others. As it is commercial area the value of daily labors is high.

3. Social causes

I came to Dhaka with my friend for the first time. My friend used to work at karwan bazar who was a labore of vegetable store house. I was called some time when there was a shortage of labore. The owner of that store house wanted a liable persona for his store house. Then my friend (motiur 60) introduced me with the owner. Then I started my work at the store house. The days were going fine I decided to promote my position for that purposes I opened a shop of vegetable but I could not continue. Where I lived there were many daily labore I got information about that profession, amount of money time of working period, working place etc. form then I am working this profession now.

4. Why not the others hat

Actually I have no alternative of going. As I am familiars with this locality it is easy to get work. I have linkages and a channel with my friend in this area. If I face any problem I can get help form them and living facilities of this area is satisfaction able for me. And the another Causes for living here is illusion, thinking these I cannot leave this area. Shifting an area is very much troublesome. Coming back to my room by working whole day I do not enough time to think about it.

5. Daily wage

Most of the time wage depends on types of work. Generally the wage of a daily labore is 500-800 tk per day. The working period is 8am to 5pm. When a labore is late more than ten minutes his wags is being decreased. Wage depends on the risky condition of worked. If it is in more than two or three floors the daily payment is higher than ground floor or first floors. Working in the ground or first floors there is no risk. For heavy work the wage is high. For metal related work or loading heavy weight daily payment is high because it is hard work.

6. Discrimination of wage

Form my work experience I noticed that wage varies age to age. The contractors seek young labore
than hold. As aged person I am to face various questions. The contractors hire us when there is shortage of labore. Sometimes they offer low wage. As we are aged person they argue that you are aged person. Your working ability is lower than the young. It is not true that the older can do less work than the younger. Sometimes I can do more work than the Youngers. Then I did not claim more money. I take what I deserve.

7. Discrimination of labore based on gender

Form the very beginning of our civilization there is a gender discrimination on labore market. It is thought that women can do less work than men. A men can do all types of work but women cannot do women are hired only for helping purpose they are hired for giving water, helping for mixing cement and sand. Women cannot move heavy wait but their work is not less importance I think labore discrimination is not right every worker should be taken as equal labore force.

8. Exploitation by labore leaders and others

I think labore means exploitation and torture. It is my own experience. Very confidently I can declare that among the all classes of working sectors the laborers are exploited very roughly. In our sector there is less effect of labore leader at present. But ones upon a time getting a work without a labore leaders was very tough. Labour leader could contact with owner and they could negotiate about money, time, place and they also could monitor to us. They could try to govern and dominate over us. We were given money by their hand. We did not get money according to ours work. Labore leader ware catalyst of our work. We could not contact with the owner directly. But the system has been changed. We can easily contact and negotiate.

9. Broker

There is a similarity between labore and broker. Both of their work is catalyzing. At present their influence is very few. Most of the get kipper and caretaker work as broker. The owner of house give them duty to collect workers. It happens when the owner of a house is absent. The get keepers and caretakers try to negotiate with labore about the amount money. Maximum time they take a big part of money. They maximize profit by collecting unexpert workers. They hired labore but do not give them promised money.

10. From when to when

Laborers come to this market very early in the morning. It is about 6:00 am to 11:00am. Labors wait here for being hired. Who are selected they leave the place. The others are to wait until they are hired.

11. Unemployed Day

In my young age when I did not get work then I used to play card, ludu, caram ect. Among these games I prefer playing card to others. Sometimes I used to go for roaming with my friends (abbas 52) but now the scenario has been totally changed. Now I am 56 years old. My friend circle has shifted form here. Sometimes I do not get interest like before. At present when I do not get work I clean my tools and sharp them. I try to do my house hold activities. Everything is being changed due to time.

12. Classes of work and there name

Actually there is no definite types of work in this market. Any types of work is done when we get. Like helper of building construction, helper of tiles, dying helper, cutting soil, bricks, sand, rode, cutting trees, sweeping, and construction related activities. Sometimes we are to work as helper of cooker. Sometimes we are to work as a drain cleaner. Even we are to work as a drain cleaner. It can be side that we are all-rounder.

13. Who does which work?

Because of age and physical condition works do not differ much. But a little bit difference is seen between the work men and women. Women are given easy and less hard work. Giving water to brick, sweeping floor, helping the contractor etc. are easy work. Women do these work but the men are to do heavy work. Women cannot do hard work because of their physical structure. Wage is determined by ones activities. Actually a worker is to come this sector to do any kind of work.

14. How is sold

First of all we come to labore market very early in the morning. Then we wait for the owners.
the owner come here we speaks with him and negotiate. We discuss about details like working place, types of work, time, and wage. Most of the time we are to bargain for our wage. The tendency of the owner is maximization of profit. When it is dull season wage is lower but in the active season there is a good change if bargain. Worker who are very poor they become agree with low wage. It is an oral agreement not in retained form.

15. **How is to go in working place**

In general we go to our work place walking on foot. Maximum time we work in this area. When the working place is far we go there by rickshaw or bus. We come back to our house spending our own money. One day I went to narayanganj by a car of a owner I work there four days. They were pleased in my work. They gave me extra money. I was also very happy.

16. **Deceit and way of deception**

In my whole life I did not face any kind of deceit. But I heard about it from my company. My friend harun (40) said that one day he want to Mirpur for work. Whole day he worked. When it was a afternoon the broker flew away but friend did not his payment .deceit is rare now sometimes broker try to deceit with labor but it is seen very few.

17. **Dress**

As we are poor people we cannot buy new shirt regularly. We work wearing old shirt. When we need a shirt very badly we purchase it from street market. Street cloth are very cheap. I also buy cloth for my family members from footpath.

18. **Food habit and nutrition**

As we are daily labour every day we are to take our lunch in our work place. We take our meal at night in our house. Sometimes I buy food from hotel. All time I try to save money for my family. So I take cheap food. Sometimes I buy fish, chicken, meat and vegetable from market. I just give priority of food quantity not food quality. When I have my meal I do not think about nutrition.

19. **Education of children**

Because of my poverty I cannot bear my expense my family cost let alone bear the expense the education. I am to lead my from life hand to mouth. Where leaving with square meal is the main challenge there education is nothing but luxuries dream. If my children go to school who will do the house hold work.

20. **Religious beliefs, rituals and culture**

We beliefs in Allah. Every Friday I pray to Allah. I try to attend all Muslim festivals, program and religion activities. All time I try to live my life according to Islam. During the time of Eid I spend time with my family.

21. **Language**

It was very difficult to understand local language of my colleague. Gradually I have been able to cope with it. When I came to karwan bazar area for the first time I was totally unable to understand the local language of noakhali people. The speak very firstly. Now I can understand their speech. My co-workers also can understand my speech.

22. **Complement with others workers**

I just do my work. I do not think about the others. I think I am well in this profession. The others are also well in their profession. It a good profession for daily labour who need cash money instantly. There are many works where money is given later. Duty time is more than its payment. There is no freedom in gate keeping profession but in my profession there is huge opportunities to choose work area and work type.

**Discussion**

Day labourers share a number of common characteristics. The availability of water and toilet facilities in determining the location of the site that these men choose is a pertinent example of this. Certain distinguishing factors are also evident from the study. There are clear interregional differences in the circumstances facing day labourers in Bangladesh. On the whole, day labourers earn higher income in cities and larger towns than in urban areas. There were also obvious differences in the morale and spirit of the day labourers. Day labourers in the main industrialized areas of the country tend to be far more positive in their outlook on life than their counterparts in other areas. Dhaka-city differences in the circumstances at the various hiring sites exist in almost all the major cities and regional centers. For example every centre has sites where the income earned is higher than that of other sites.
Also, day labourers at some sites are hired more often than those at other sites. Some of the sites bring together day labourers with a higher level of skills. Some of the sites in a specific city brought together day labourers who appeared to be hard working, skilled individuals, while other sites in the same city were demonstrative of social problems (e.g. alcohol abuse). In moving from these general observations to the specific empirical analysis, the next section of the paper investigated the spatial distribution of day labourers in Bangladesh.

The Bangladesh space-economy is characterized, inter alia, by spatial disparities in levels of socio-economic development, GDP, unemployment and distribution in the numbers of day labourers. These spatial patterns and disparities are not random: they tend to be related. There is a negative relationship between unemployment and GDP at provincial level and a positive relationship between GDP and day labourers. Provinces in which a high percentage of the GDP of the country is produced tend to have lower levels of unemployment, but higher numbers of day labourers. The provinces that contribute only a small percentage of the country’s GDP tend to have high unemployment rates and very small numbers of day labourers. There is also a general spatial coincidence between levels of development according to certain multiple socio-economic variables and the numbers of day labourers, with a relatively high correlation between the two. Although the data obtained on day labourers have not yet been supplemented by detailed structured interviews with a sample of the established research population, the available data do show that areas with high levels of development, which form part of the core regions of the country, such as Cape Town, Durban, Pretoria and Johannesburg, tend to have multiple day labour sites with high numbers per site and high numbers per area in general.

The presence of day labourers and the number of labourers at specific sites are not an indication of high unemployment in such areas. The presence and number of day labourers is actually an indication of potential job opportunities and therefore higher levels of development. The existence of job opportunities, however, implies that these men are removed from their families and the social connections that go hand in hand with this. This scenario may be attributed to the fact that many of the day labourers who stand on street corners in the metropolitan areas, actually come from the urban areas (where development levels are low and the unemployment rate is high) to seek work in the urban areas. One of the issues not covered in the present survey is the location of the day labourers homes. This survey should be followed up with in-depth interviews, where a detailed questionnaire can be used as a tool for structured interviews, of a scientifically determined sample of the research population based on this countrywide survey. This will enable researchers to study issues such as labour migration, permanent as well as circular, employment history, income earned, social networks and the skills levels of day labourers.

Conclusion

The present study was an attempt to determine the factors affecting the livelihood of the socioeconomic improvement of migrants and to analyze the causes of rural-urban migration in slum areas. Urban areas have no available formal education facilities and slum people were found to be engaged in rickshaw pulling, day labourer, petty business, small job services etc. Analysis showed that migration and taking in micro credit were beneficial for urban day laborers.

Receiving and utilizing micro credit income level, consumption, expenditure and socio-economic status of the urban improved to some extent. Due to participation of urban day laborers in NGOs, their economic, social and decision making improved substantially. Credit disbursement through NGOs with integrated approach could bring positive changes in the life of poor urban women as well as their community. Findings showed that Fifty six per cent people migrated to Dhaka city for economic reason. Factors of migration had a significant contribution of rural urban migration and also significant livelihood improvement has taken place due to micro credit.

At the individual level, the women were benefited in terms of mobility and skill, self-confidence, widening of interests, access to financial services, build own savings, competence in public affairs and status at home and in the community that lead a better awareness for enhancing women’s empowerment. However, there is a need for proper training for sustainable result in the long run.
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