

The Socio-spatial Differentials of Political Behavior of the Urban Poor in Bangladesh

Shahadat Hossain^{*}

Abstract: Gottdiener and Feagain proposed the socio-spatial approach as an integrated method for explaining the role of both settlement space and compositional/social characteristics in human behavior. This paper explores the relationships between socio-spatial characteristics and political behavior of the urban poor. Data were collected from three lower income neighborhoods in Dhaka City, Bangladesh, through a structured questionnaire. The study reveals that the participation of the urban poor into electoral and action politics and their interaction with elected urban bodies are largely determined by their neighborhood and housing and compositional factors. However, the paper argues that settlement space and social/compositional characteristics play significant role in political behavior of the urban poor.

Introduction:

The exploring politics of the urban poor is of paramount significance for social policy but the dearth of quantitative or in-depth analysis speaks of the difficulty in conducting research on the political behavior of the impoverished citizens (Lawless and Fox, 2001). While political participation of the urban poor is essential for fair representation within the political system, most of the existing literature indicates that those living in poverty lack the necessary material and social resources that motivate participation (Cohen and Dawson, 1993; Verba et al, 1995; Hossain, 2003). Despite providing the broad and compelling explanations of the lower level of political integration of the urban poor these literatures often do explain variations in the pattern of the political behavior of the urban poor. The paper attempts to explain socio-spatial differentials in the political behavior of the urban poor in Bangladesh. Data were collected from the urban poor living in three different neighborhoods in Dhaka City, Bangladesh, through using a structured questionnaire constructed on socio-spatial characteristics and political behavior especially their voting behavior, attending action politics, organizational behavior, and interaction with urban government. However, the paper argues that both settlement space especially neighborhood and housing and social/compositional characteristics like neighborhood, housing, age, sex, education, employment, income, as well as city exposure largely determine the political behavior of the urban poor in Bangladesh.

^{*} School of Sociology, The University of New South Wales, NSW 2052, Sydney, Australia
E-mail: Shahadat72@yahoo.com

Explaining Socio-Spatial Perspective (SSP):

Socio-Spatial Perspective (SSP) developed by the writings of both Weberian and Marxian sociologists, has tried to explain human behavior from an integrated point of view. It attempts to take what is best from the new ideas while avoiding the endemic reductionism characteristics of both traditional ecology and recent Marxian political economy. It does not seek explanation by emphasizing a principal cause such as transportation technology, capital circulation, or production process. Rather, it takes an integrated view of growth as the linked outcome of economic, political and cultural factors. Lefebvre (1991) is without question the seminal source of new thinking on the city from a critical and Marxian perspective. Inspired by the work of Lefebvre, Feagin (1983, 1987) and Gottdiener (1985, 1987) use the socio-spatial approach to explain city life. The approach tried to solve the continuing debate on the role of social/compositional factors and spatial factors in human behavior. The socio-spatial approach considered the view as limited, which regarded the space of habitation as a container of social activities. Space not only contains actions but also acts as a part of social relations and is intimately involved in daily lives. It affects the way people feel about what to do. In turn, people alter space and construct new environments to fit their needs better. Hence there is a dual relationship between people and space. On the one hand, human beings act according to social factors such as gender, class, race, age, and status within and in reaction to a given space. On the other hand, people also create spaces for themselves that express their needs and desires (Gottdiener, 1994). The perspective links the dual relationship between people and space with the social factors that are the bases of individual behavior. The most basic concept of this approach is that of the settlement space, which refers to the built environment in which people live. Settlement space is both constructed and organized. People build it following some meaningful plans for the containing economic, political and cultural activities. People organize their daily actions according to the meaningful aspects of constructed space. The perspective, however, captures the interaction between space and society. Some of the factors that affect behavior are traditional concepts of sociology, such as gender, class, social status, age, and race. To these it adds the elements of space itself (Gottdiener, 1994).

Data & Method:

The study was conducted in three lower income neighborhoods in Dhaka City, Bangladesh from October 2002 to July 2003. These neighborhoods are *Adabor* under City Ward-43, *Gandaria* under City Ward -81 and *Kalsi* under City Ward-2. These neighborhoods represent various forms of urban adaptations of the poor migrants in the city. *Adabor* developed as the low costing housing area where the poor rent houses mostly form the land leasers by paying a small amount of money. *Gandaria* is mostly dominated by the poor settlements developed as squatters and *Kalsi* developed as the resettlement camp for the destitute population by the urban government. Five hundred respondents were selected for interview from the three neighborhoods proportionately. They were selected randomly from different strata based on age, sex, education, employment, income, and urban residence pattern. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire constructed on the socio-spatial characteristics and political behavior especially voting behavior, participation in action politics, organizational behavior, as well as interaction with the urban bodies. Both descriptive (percentage) and inferential (co-efficient of correlations) statistics are used for data analysis. The study reveals that the urban poor are politically active and they are desperate to integrate with the larger urban political systems. But their level of involvement in urban politics is largely determined by their socio-spatial characteristics.

Findings:***Neighborhood Differentials***

The urban poor are living in three different neighborhoods i.e, *Adabor* (39%), *Gandaria* (25%) and *Kalsi* (36%). The neighborhood has a definite impact on the political behavior of the urban poor. Eighty percent of the poor in *Kalsi* are voters in the city; whereas less than fifty percent of the poor living in *Adabor* are city voters. The percentage is relatively higher (65.6%) among the poor living in *Gandaria*. Most of the poor of *Adabor* (58.5%) are the voters in their ancestral village where they cast votes in union level elections. But 37.6 % of *Gandaria* and 30.6% of *Kalsi* are the voters in their ancestral villages. Casting votes in parliamentary election and city corporation election is also higher among the poor living in *Kalsi* than those living in the other neighborhoods. More than 72% of the poor living in *Kalsi* cast their votes in the recent elections. Party support and participation in political activities is higher among the poor

living in *Gandaria*. The poor of *Gandaia* (40.0%) and *Kalsi* (47.8%) were politically more aware and registered as city voters by themselves. The poor living in *Kalsi* are comparatively more affiliated with organizations (33.9%) and bargained more with urban elected bodies. Most of the poor of *Adabor* (69.7%) are directly affected by the recent urban policies but only 15.4 % of them protested these policies. However, the neighborhood is significantly correlated with being voters in the city ($r = -.274$ at 0.01), being voter in the ancestral villages ($r = .245$ at 0.01), voting in parliamentary election ($r = -.261$ at 0.01), voting in city corporation election ($r = -.294$ at 0.01), supporting political parties ($r = -.155$ at 0.01), voter registration by self ($r = -.175$ at 0.01), bargaining with the urban elected bodies ($r = -.169$ at 0.01) and being affected by urban policies ($r = .123$ at 0.01).

Housing Differentials

The urban poor are mostly living in *jupri* (47.4%), temporarily made of bamboo and straw, and tin-shed housing (34.6%). Only 18 % of them are living in the *semi-pucca/pucca* housing having a permanent wall of cement. About 72% of the urban poor who are living in *jupri* are city voters whereas the percentages are 53.1% and 67.7 % for the poor living in tin-shed and *semi-pucca/pucca* housing respectively. The poor living in tin-shed housing is mostly (56.1 %) voters in their ancestral villages. Among the poor living in *jupri* the percentage casting votes in both parliamentary (65.4%) and city corporation (62.0%) elections is higher than the poor living in the other types of housing. Party support (71.7%) and participation in political activities (31.6 %) is also higher among the poor living in *jupri*. But the poor living in *semi-pucca/pucca* are politically more aware. About 47% of them registered as city voters by themselves and more than 73 % of them cast votes by their choice. The poor living in tin-shed and *semi-pucca/pucca* housing are more affiliated with organizations than the poor living in *jupri*. Only 15.6% of the urban poor living in tin-shed housing have ever bargained with the urban elected bodies, whereas 27.4% of the poor living in *jupri* bargained with these bodies. The poor living in *semi-pucca/pucca* housing (44.4%) is less affected by the recent urban policies. Although most of the poor (64.2%) living in tin-shed housing are affected by the recent urban policies, only about 16 % of them protested the policies. Housing type of the poor is significantly correlated with their being voter in

their ancestral villages ($r = -.131$ at 0.01), voting in parliamentary election ($r = .090$ at 0.05), voting in city corporation election ($r = .093$ at 0.05), participating political activities ($r = .105$ at 0.05), voting by own choice ($r = -.089$ at 0.05), bargaining with the urban elected bodies ($r = .094$ at 0.05) and being affected by urban policies ($r = .097$ at 0.05).

Age Differentials

The urban poor are mostly (80%) within the age of 45 years. Among them 39% are younger populations, who are not more than 30 years of age. Another 41% are middle-aged population from 31 years to 45 years of age. Only 20% of the urban poor are aged who are 46 or more years of age. Less than fifty percent of the younger poor are voters in the city whereas 83% percent of the aged poor are voters in the city. Most of the younger (44.1%) and middle-aged (47.3%) poor are voters in their ancestral villages. The percentage casting votes in both parliamentary election and city corporation election is higher among the aged poor than the poor of other age groups. Although party support is higher among the middle-aged poor, participation in political activities is slightly higher among the aged poor. Only about 29 % of younger poor were politically aware and registered as city voters by themselves, whereas 42 % of middle-aged poor and 49% of aged poor registered by themselves. About 35% of the middle-aged poor and 31.0% of the aged poor are affiliated with organizations. The aged poor have more contact with the urban elected bodies. The middle-aged poor are mostly affected by the urban policies. That's why this group of poor protested the policies more than the other groups of poor. Age is significantly correlated with being voters in the city ($r = -.283$ at 0.01), voting in parliamentary election ($r = -.300$ at 0.01), voting in city corporation election ($r = -.249$ at 0.01), voter registration by self ($r = -.162$ at 0.01), affiliation with organizations ($r = -.112$ at 0.05) and bargaining with the elected bodies ($r = -.116$ at 0.01)

Gender Differentials

The number of male respondent (72.6%) is significantly higher among the urban poor. Though the number of city voters is slightly higher among the poor men, the number of village voters is quite higher among them. The percentages for male and female village

voters are 46.8% and 33.6% respectively. Casting votes in parliamentary election and city corporation election are also higher among the poor men. Only 13.8% of poor women participate in different political activities whereas 32.5 % of poor men participate in these activities. As men were more aware about their political rights, most of them (39.1%) registered as city voters by themselves. As women are more dependent on their male guardians (fathers or husbands), they have less freedom in casting votes. More than 29% of poor women are affiliated with different organizations. Only about 16% of them have ever bargained with the urban elected bodies whereas more than 24% poor men bargained with these bodies. Only about 5 % women protested these policies whereas 17.4% men protested these policies. Gender is significantly correlated with being voters in ancestral villages ($r = .119$ at 0.05), participation in political activities ($r = .186$ at 0.01), voting by own choice ($r = .145$ at 0.01), bargaining with the elected bodies ($r = .088$ at 0.05) and protesting urban policies ($r = .168$ at 0.01).

Education Differentials

More than 60% of the urban poor have never enrolled in schools in their lifetime. And the rest of them have at least primary level of schooling. The literacy status also affects political participation of the urban poor. The number of both city voters and village voters is higher among the poor having schooling. About 59% of the poor having schooling cast their votes in parliamentary election whereas 48.5% of the poor having no schooling cast their votes in the election. The percentage of casting votes in the city corporation election is also higher among the poor having schooling. Though party support and participation in political activities is higher among the poor having no schooling; the poor having schooling are politically more aware. More than 43% of the poor having schooling registered as city voter by themselves whereas 35% of the poor having no schooling registered by themselves. The poor having schooling are more affiliated with organizations but they are less involved in bargaining with the urban elected bodies. More than 63% of the poor having no schooling are affected by the recent urban policies. As they are more affected by these policies their participation in protesting the policies is much higher. However, schooling is significantly correlated with their affiliation with organizations ($r = .113$ at 0.05), being affected by the urban policies ($r = .105$ at 0.05) and protesting the policies ($r = -.093$ at 0.05).

Employment Differentials

Most of the urban poor (63.6%) work as wage laborer while only about 23% are involved in self operated petty trade. Another 13.6% are currently unemployed, who are mostly female and involved in unpaid household work. Self-employed poor are mostly (81.6%) voters in the city, though the number of voters in the villages is comparatively lower among them. More than 70% of the self-employed poor cast their votes in both parliamentary election and city corporation election. Whereas 52.5% and 48.1% of the urban poor working as wage laborer cast their votes in parliamentary election and city corporation election respectively. Though political support is comparatively higher among the self-employed poor, participation in political activities is higher among the poor working as wage laborer. Only 31.4% of the poor working as wage laborer registered as voters by themselves whereas 51.8% of the self-employed and 47.1% of unemployed poor registered as city voters by themselves. The unemployed poor have less freedom in casting votes than the other groups of poor. The affiliation with organization is much higher among the self-employed poor. The unemployed poor have less contact with the urban elected bodies. Though the significant portions (57.4%) of unemployed poor are affected by the urban policies, only about 6% of them protested the policies. Employment status is significantly correlated with being voters in the city ($r = -.113$ at 0.05), being voters in the villages (.089 at 0.05), voting in parliamentary election (-.101 at 0.05), voting in city corporation election (-.128 at 0.01), participating in political activities (.152 at 0.01) and voter registration by self (-.1577 at 0.05).

Income Differentials

About 44 % of the urban poor are hardcore whose household income is up to BD Tk.3500 per month. Another 56% are absolute poor whose household income is above BD Tk. 3500 per month. Their level of poverty significantly determines their involvement in politics. The percentages of city voters among the hardcore and absolute poor are 58.4% and 69.5% respectively. But the number of village voters is higher among the hardcore poor by 7.7 %. The percentage of casting votes in both parliamentary election and city corporation election is higher among the absolute poor than the hardcore poor. In the last city corporation election 60.2% percent of the absolute poor cast their votes where as 48% of the

hardcore poor cast their votes in the election. Party support is quite high among the absolute poor though the participation in political activities is higher among the hardcore poor by 5.3%. As the absolute poor are politically more aware, they mostly registered as voters and cast their votes by their choice. More than 34% of the absolute poor are affiliated with different organizations whereas only about 20% of hardcore poor are affiliated with these organizations. The absolute poor also have more contacts with the elected bodies. The recent urban policies affects 62.4% percent of the hardcore poor but only 12.7% of them protested the policies. The level of poverty is significantly correlated with being voters in the city ($r = -.116$ at 0.01), voting in parliamentary election ($r = -.108$ at 0.05), voting in city corporation election ($r = -.122$ at 0.01), party support ($r = -.097$ at 0.05) and being affiliated with organizations ($r = -.155$ at 0.01).

Urban Residence Differentials

Most of the urban poor (61.2%) are long-term city residents who are living in the city for more than 10 years. Their length of residence in the city is also an important determinant of their political integration. The long-term residents are mostly (83.7%) voters in the city whereas the short-term residents are mostly (70.6%) voters in their ancestral villages. The difference of casting votes between the two types of poor is also significant. About 72% of the long-term residents cast their votes in parliamentary election and city corporation election whereas less than one-third of the short-term residents cast their votes in these elections. Party support and participation in the political activities is also higher among the long-term residents. About 50% of the long-term residents became voters in the city by their choice whereas only about 20% of the short-term residents became voters by their choice. As the long-term residents are more aware they cast their votes more independently. The organizational affiliation is also higher among the long-term residents. Only about 8% of the short-term residents have ever bargained with the elected bodies whereas 30.7% of the long-term residents bargained with these bodies. Though most of the poor are affected by the recent urban policies, only about 9% of the short-term residents have ever protested the policies. However the urban residence is significantly correlated with being voters in the city ($r = -.501$ at 0.01), being voters in the villages ($r = .111$ at 0.01), voting in parliamentary election ($r = -.195$ at 0.01), voting in city corporation election ($r = -.123$ at 0.01), voter registration by self ($r = -.297$ at 0.05), voting by own choice ($r = -.157$ at 0.01), affiliated with organizations ($r = -.189$ at 0.01), bargaining with the elected bodies ($r = -.264$ at 0.01) and protesting the urban policies ($r = -.116$ at 0.05).

Discussion:

The characteristics of the neighborhood determine the political behavior of the urban poor. The political behavior of the urban poor refers to their political activities such as voting in elections, participation in action politics, organizational memberships and interaction with the local urban government. These political activities of the urban poor depend on the spare time they get after earning their livelihood and also on their interest in politics. The neighborhood of *Kalsi* is an urban fringe where the poor have been resettled by the government. The poor living in the neighborhood actively participate in politics to get shelter and other benefits from the government. Due to various community-based organizations in the neighborhood the poor are politically more aware. *Gandaria* is located near city centre where the poor developed squatter settlements. They also actively participate in the political activities in order to get protection from the political leaders. The neighborhood of *Adabor* is different from the other two neighborhoods as it developed recently as a low cost housing area where the poor are living by paying a small amount of rent. The poor in the neighborhood are less active in politics as they are not getting any support from the government. The type of housing where the urban poor are living is also a determinant of their political behavior. The poor who are living in *jupri*, temporary housing made of bamboo and straw, are more active in city politics to protect their settlements with help from local political leaders. The poor living in *semi-pucca/pucca* housing are less active in political activities as they are less dependent on local political leaders. But the poor living in the *semi-pucca/pucca* housing are politically aware because of their better socio-economic background. They are less affected by urban policies adopted by the government, as the housing and employment of the poor is less dependent on these policies. The role of settlement in the political behavior of the urban poor justifies the Gottdiner's (1994:16) argument "the factor of space constitutes a part of social relations and is intimately involved in our daily life".

The political behavior of the urban poor is also determined by their age. The aged poor are more active in urban politics. They are mostly city voters and cast their votes in both national and city elections. As the aged poor loose their contact with their ancestral villages for long stay in the city, their connection with their ancestral villages become lesser. That's why only a small percentage of the aged poor are voters in their ancestral villages. The younger poor become voters in the city being influenced by their guardians like father or elder brother. Sometimes the local guardians like landlord

or community leaders also influence them. Affiliation with organizations is higher among the middle-aged and aged population as they are more aware about organizational affiliation and other political matters due to their better political understanding and more city experience. Due to seniority the aged poor get more attention from the elected bodies so they have more contact with these bodies. However, in spite of their age their participation in protesting the urban polices is not higher. Nelson noticed the age differences in political behavior of the urban poor in different developing societies. He (1979:114) points out, "young people participate less politically because they are preoccupied with personal matters – finding a job with prospects for advancement, choosing a mate, completing an education, locating a place to live."

Gender also determines the political behavior of the urban poor. The participation in political activities is higher among male than female because of the existing social structure. The existing patriarchal social system helps to perpetuate the economic and social inequality of women (Kabeer, 1991; White, 1992; Dannecker, 2002). In many instances, their participation in politics and in other activities is dependent on the decisions from their male guardians like father or husband. The existing religious values don't encourage equal participation in the development activities especially political activities. But it is true that the participation of female in urban politics is much higher than their rural counterparts. It becomes possible due to living in the urban environment and their empowerment through participation in urban labor market.

The level of education also determines the political behavior of the urban poor. The poor having at least primary level of schooling can realize their political rights better than those who have no any schooling in their life; as such, the percentage of casting votes in different elections is higher among the poor who have at least primary level of schooling. Due to their schooling they become politically more aware and can apply their reason better in casting votes rather than being directed by the others, from their communities or from outside their communities. The poor who have no primary level of schooling are mostly dependent on others in choosing the right person as their leader. The poor having no schooling is more affected by the government policies as they are mostly doing unskilled jobs like rickshaw pulling which, is recently being restricted by blocking off the main streets of the city. The relationship between the level of education and urban adaptation has been supported by a number of previous studies (Caldwell, 1969; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Hussain, 1996; Afsar, 2000).

Employment status of the poor determines their participation in urban politics. The unemployed poor are less integrated with politics as most of them are female and involved in household activities. They can't even take their decisions regarding political matters independently due to their dependence. The type of employment in which the poor are involved is also important for integrating in city politics. The poor working as a day labor get less time to be involved into politics because they are mostly busy looking for jobs. In order to avoid underemployment situation they try to find a second job while they are doing one. As the self-employed poor have no problem of being unemployed, they can pass their time in a relatively relaxed manner and can be more involved in politics. Shah and Smith (1984: 297) findings on urban female migrants also support the role of employment on integration. They point out, "entry into the urban labor market has important implications for adjustments. The type of economic activity that she enters into is crucial not only for her initial adjustments to the city but also for future her social mobility within the urban environment".

The level of poverty is also a determinant of political behavior of the urban poor. Absolute poor are more integrated with urban political systems than the hardcore poor. As the hardcore poor are mainly busy looking for work they cannot get enough time to be involved in politics. Beside these, due to their economic marginality they become social and politically marginalized. The local political leaders don't care much about this section of the poor, as they have no influence on the other sections of the poor. The hardcore poor keep greater distance from the powerful sections and hardly maintain contact with the elected urban bodies. On the other hand, the absolute poor are financially in a better position and they become more interested in politics. They get more attention from the political leaders and maintain greater contact with them. Due to better socio-economic conditions the absolute poor are politically more aware than the hardcore poor. Generally political radicalism is absent among the urban poor because they always think about their basic needs necessary for survival in the city and they don't plan for any revolution to change the present power structure. This implies that political consciousness of the urban poor is not necessarily engendered by their serious deprivation, which is also noted by scholars working on the urban poor in developing countries (Eckstein, 1990; Gilbert, 1992; Gugler 1997).

Finally, urban residence has a definite impact on the political behavior of the urban. Due to living in the city for a long period of time they become more exposed to the urban life. They gradually know more about the city and participate in different activities including political activities. Beside this, when they loose their bondage with their ancestral village, due to stay in the city for a long period of time, they become involved in city politics. Nelson (1979: 115) further points out, "recent arrivals are preoccupied with finding suitable long-term employment and housing, settling their families if they are married, choosing mates if they are not, and generally adjusting to urban life. Their circle of friends may be limited. They are less likely than the established urbanities (natives or earlier migrants) to belong to voluntary association." Hossain (2000: 195) observed "recent migrants are more alienated in the new urban environment than long term migrants because of homesickness and initial instability".

Conclusion:

The urban poor cannot play an important role in urban politics due to their social and economic marginality. But that doesn't mean that the urban poor are politically indifferent. Rather, the urban poor are desperate to be integrated with the larger urban political systems to overcome their marginalized position. Their level of involvement in urban politics is determined by their socio-spatial characteristics. The characteristics of the settlement space especially the neighborhood and housing where the poor are living and the pattern of internal organizations largely determine their political behavior. Beside the space settlement, social/compositional factors like age, sex, education, employment, income and urban residence also determine their political behavior. There is a variation within the level of influences of the socio-spatial variables. The neighborhood characteristics, poverty level and urban residence are relatively more important determinants of political behavior of the urban poor especially for their voting behavior, party affiliation, attending action politics, organizational behavior as well as their interaction with urban government. Therefore, the socio-spatial approach, which combines settlement space, demographic, social and economic factors, could be effective in explaining the political behavior of the urban poor.

References:

- Afsar, Rita. 2000. *Rural-Urban Migration in Bangladesh*. Dhaka: University Press Limited
- Caldwell, J.C. 1969. *African Rural-Urban Migration: The Movement to Ghana's Towns*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Cohen, C, J and M, C, Dawson. 1993. 'Neighborhood Politics and African American Politics' *American Political Science Review*, 87, pp. 286-302
- Dannecker, Petra. 2002. *Between Conformity and Resistance*. Dhaka: University Press Limited

- Eckstein, S. 1990. 'Poor People versus the State and Capital: Anatomy of a Successful Community Mobilization for Housing in Mexico City' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 14 (2), pp. 274 -96
- Feagin, J. 1983. *The Urban Real State Game*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- 1987. *Houston: The Free Enterprise City*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press
- Gottdiener, M. 1985. *The Social Production of Urban Space*. Austin: University of Texas Press
- 1987. 'Space as a Force of Production: Contribution to the Debate on Realism, Capitalism and Space' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 11, 3, pp. 405-16
- 1994. *The New Urban Sociology*. McGraw-Hill: New York
- Gilbert, A. 1992. *Cities, Poverty and Development: Urbanization in the Third World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Gugler, J. 1997. *Cities in the Developing World: Issues, Theory, and Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Hossain, Shahadat. (2000) 'Factors Affecting the Process of Adaptation and Modernization of Poor Migrants in Dhaka City' *Social Science Review*, 17, 2, pp. 188-195
- (2003) 'Urban Poverty and Social Marginality: The Case of Bangladesh' in Lovejoy, F and Lester Adorjany (eds.) *Celebrations, Causes and Consequences*. pp. 69-76. Sydney: UNSW
- Hussain, S, H. (1996). *Female Migrants' Adaptation in Dhaka: A Case of Process of Urban Socio-Economic Change*. Dhaka: Urban Studies Program
- Kabeer, Naila. 1991. 'Cultural Dopes or Rational Fools? Women and Labor Supply in the Bangladesh Garments Industry' *The European Journal of Development Research*. 3, 1, pp. 133-160
- Lawless, J, L and R, L, Fox.2001. 'Political Participation of the Urban Poor' *Social Problems*, 48, 2, pp. 362-385
- Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Nelson, J, M.1979. *Access to Power: Politics and the Urban Poor in Developing Nations*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press
- Oberai, A. S and M.H.K. Singh. 1983. *Causes and Consequences of Internal Migration: A Study in the Indian Punjab*. Delhi: Oxford University Press
- Shah, N.M and P, C, Smith. 1984. 'Migrant Women at Work in Asia' in Fawcett et al. (Eds.) *Women in the Cities of Asia: Migration and Urban Adaptation*. Boulder: Westview
- Verba, S, K, L, Schlozman and H, Brady.1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, M A: Harvard University Press
- White, S, C. 1992. *Arguing with the Crocodile: Gender and Class in Bangladesh*. Dhaka: University Press Limited

Appendixes:

Table-1: Socio-spatial Characteristics of the Urban Poor

<u>Socio-spatial characteristics</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Neighborhood:		
<i>Adabor</i> (City Ward-43)	195	39.0
<i>Gandaria</i> (City Ward-81)	125	25.0
<i>Kalsi</i> (City Ward-2)	180	36.0
Housing type:		
<i>Jupri</i>	237	47.4
<i>Tin-shed</i>	173	34.6
<i>Semi-pucca/pucca</i>	90	18.0
Age:		
Younger (Up to 30 Yrs)	195	39.0
Middle Aged (31-45 Yrs)	205	41.0
Aged (46 Yrs+)	100	20.0
Gender:		

Neighborhood	-0.274** (.000)	.245** (.000)	-0.261** (.000)	-0.294** (.000)	-0.155** (.000)	-.063 (.161)	-.175** (.000)	.006 (.888)	-.068 (.129)	-.169** (.000)	.123** (.006)	.026 (.557)
Housing type	.078 (.082)	-.131** (.003)	.090* (.044)	.093* (.038)	.077 (.086)	.105* (.018)	-.017 (.701)	-.089* (.048)	-.056 (.213)	.094* (.036)	.097* (.030)	.021 (.641)
Age	-.283** (.000)	.065 (.147)	-.300** (.000)	-.249** (.000)	-.017 (.701)	-.060 (.177)	-.162** (.000)	.026 (.562)	-.112* (.012)	-.116** (.009)	-.029 (.523)	-.009 (.847)
Gender	.033 (.464)	.199* (.008)	.031 (.483)	.028 (.536)	.026 (.560)	.186** (.000)	.031 (.492)	.145** (.001)	-.014 (.761)	.088* (.049)	.083 (.063)	.168** (.000)
Education	-.006 (.888)	-.032 (.473)	-.014 (.748)	-.017 (.708)	.051 (.259)	.037 (.415)	-.082 (.067)	-.006 (.888)	-.113* (.001)	.013 (.768)	.105* (.019)	-.093* (.038)
Employment	-.113* (.012)	.089* (.046)	-.101* (.024)	-.128** (.004)	-.018 (.690)	.152** (.001)	-.157** (.000)	.055 (.220)	-.071 (.114)	.074 (.101)	.056 (.209)	.076 (.089)
overty level	-.116** (.009)	.077 (.084)	-.108* (.016)	-.122** (.006)	-.097* (.031)	.058 (.194)	-.078 (.081)	-.040 (.370)	-.155** (.001)	-.016 (.725)	.059 (.190)	-.029 (.515)
Urban residence	-.501** (.000)	.111** (.000)	-.195** (.000)	-.123** (.000)	-.086 (.056)	-.081 (.060)	-.297* (.000)	-.157** (.000)	-.189** (.000)	-.264** (.000)	-.049 (.276)	-.116** (.009)

** Correlations is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

- Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Source: Field Survey 2002-2003