

Determinants of Migration in Punjab, Pakistan: A Case Study of Faisalabad Metropolitan

MUHAMMAD FAROOQ¹, AHMAD MATEEN AND MUHAMMAD ASGHER CHEEMA

Faculty of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology University of Agriculture, Faisalabad–38040 Pakistan

¹Corresponding author's e-mail: proffarooqkharal@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT

The movement of labor out of agriculture is a universal concomitant of economic modernization and growth. Traditional migration models overlook many potential interactions between migration and development. In Pakistani society, the poor economic opportunities, rural inequality and demographic behaviour are the main determinants of migration from rural to urban areas, asking the question does distribution of land and other assets affect out-migration. This study was designed to investigate the determinants of internal migration on individuals and family at origin. The main objective of this study is to explore the relationship about the socio-economic status and determinants of internal migration by probit estimation technique. The study was carried out at Faisalabad city and four tehsils of Faisalabad district (Faisalabad, Jaranwala, Thandlianwala & Samundri). Both the urban and rural areas are consisted of eight circle areas from the city and eight villages from four tehsiles. It includes 600 interviews from eight circle areas of the city and eight villages from four tehsiles.

Key Words: Determinants; Migration; Metropolitan; Faisalabad; Punjab

INTRODUCTION

Rural urban migration in Pakistan nowadays is becoming one of the most obvious as well as influential social factors, which is profoundly changing the current system and the society as a whole. Migration from rural to urban areas may take place because village is unable to provide livelihood to the people and village living condition may be intolerable. Human beings have been moving from place-to-place for better economic and social environment. Johnson (1948) recognized rural out-migration as solution to surplus labor and low incomes in agriculture. As a matter of fact, more than 150 million international migrants celebrated the turn of the millennium outside their countries of birth. They came to their new country to work, study, join family members, or escape persecution, or violence in their home countries (IOM, 2000). While in Pakistan 10 million people, or 8% of the population of Pakistan, consisted of internal or international migrants (Census, 1998). In looking at the causes of rural to urban migration, the key question is why certain people move while human nature appears so strongly to mitigate uprooting. This is the consequence of economic globalization and market penetration (IOM, 2000). Thus, some of the surplus agricultural population, skilled population and non-skilled population have moved to the big cities and consequently put pressure on the civic institutions. On the positive side, migration may help reduce pressure on agricultural land, provide opportunities for the rural un-employed and under-employed and is associated with rising living standards and livelihood prospects at the household and community levels in urban as well as rural areas. On the negative side, some of the semi skilled population and non-skilled population have moved to the big cities and consequently put pressure on the civic institutions and also generate a problem of housing, which

raise the prices of the houses and urban properties.

According to the literature reviewed following are the push and pulls factors.

Push and pull factors

1. Decline in the per capita share in the resources such as agricultural land and stagnating agriculture, change in technology, exhaustion of mines, timber or other resources and closure of certain industries in some of the regions.
2. Reduction in employment due to mechanization.
3. Social, political and caste discrimination.
4. Availability of job and better working condition, higher wages, better sanitation, transportation and communication facilities.
5. Better opportunities for education, better standard of life, marriage freedom, safety and security, political awareness of the people of ones own choice.
6. Better health and recreational facilities for all type of people.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present research was conducted in Faisalabad city and four tehsils of Faisalabad district (Faisalabad, Jaranwala, Thandlianwala & Samundri). Both the urban and rural areas are consisted of eight circle areas from the city and eight villages from four tehsiles. In order to draw the sample from the Faisalabad city, survey lists maintained by Excise and Taxation Department were used as the sampling frame. A multi-stage sampling technique was used to draw the sample (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1992). At the first stage, Faisalabad city was selected which had already been divided into three rating zones and thirty-eight circle areas by the Excise and Taxation Department on the basis of economic stratification. At the second stage, eight circle areas are selected i.e. Ghulum Muhammad abad, Muslim

town, Peoples colony No.2, Ayub Colony, Gulistan colony and Madina town, Katchi-abadi, Raj-wali, Amin abad and Nasir colony through random sampling to observe the determinants of internal migration on the individuals and family as a institution. At the third stage, households were selected with the help of interviewers who had visited the research areas but the required information was collected wherever the migrants were found to have been living. Three hundred households were selected through random sampling technique. The respondents included the urban migrants who had migrated before 1990. Three hundred respondents were taken from the eight villages, two villages from each tehsil, selected by simple random sampling technique. probit analysis technique is used to draw the inferences. probit model is estimated through Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Pakistan is a developing country that has experienced rapid rural urban migration in the last thirty years. This study examines the determinants of internal migration in Faisalabad district. probit model was used to test the following hypotheses.

Determinants of migration (Push & Pull Factors). The findings in Table I illustrate most preferable attitude of the respondents that 35% and 50% of the respondents, relative migrated from rural areas due to low paying jobs and poor economic opportunities at the place of origin, respectively. Moreover, 15% of the respondents reported that their relatives migrated due to being relegated to surplus labor from agriculture. These findings reconcile with (Harris & Todaro, 1970; Mincer, 1978; Todaro, 1969), people indeed move from their places of origin for higher wages and better opportunities elsewhere, contributing to the uses of the surplus labor and hence economic growth.

Push factors refer to conditions at place of origin, such as decline in income opportunities, a scarcity of arable land and social discrimination, which encourage individuals to consider migration and to begin the search for alternative locations. Pull factors relate to conditions at the potential place of destination, which make them attractive place to work, or live. Relatively high wages, widespread opportunities for self-employment, or civic amenities, such as educational and health facilities, are examples of pull factors. The findings in Table II illustrate most preferable attitude of the respondents that 80% and 13% of the respondents left their place of origin due to low paying job and Poor educational facilities, respectively. These findings coincide with Chaudhury (1980) who found that out-migration is generally higher from the villages characterized by land scarcity, unequal distribution of land and high proportion of agricultural labour. Pull factors illustrate as the findings indicate that 70% of the migrants migrated from rural to urban areas for better employment with regard to enhance the household income, whereas 21% migrants left their origin for educational purposes. Moreover, 9% of the

Table I. Determinants of the individuals' migration from the rural community

Determinants of migration	Frequency	Percentage
Low paying jobs	105	35
Poor economic opportunities	150	50
Surplus labor at the agri. farm	45	15

Table II. Push and pull factors for migrants in the urban community

Push Factors	Frequency	Percentage	Pull Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Low paying jobs	240	80	High paying job	210	70
Poor educational facilities	39	13	Educational facilities	63	21
Poor rural setting	21	7	Health and marketing facilities	27	9
Total	300	100	Total	300	100

respondents reported that they migrated to avail themselves for social facilities i.e. better health and better marketing facilities. Afsar (1995) argued that migrants often benefited more than non-migrants because of their innovative risk taking and desperate nature. The benefits included higher or regular income, gain in wealth, greater access to public services and education.

Empirical Results of the Model

H-1: The poorer the economic opportunities in the rural areas of Pakistan, the greater will be rural out-migration. Land holding is considered as economic opportunities in the rural areas of Pakistan. The most important aspect of the rural economic opportunity hypothesis states that land deprivation, particularly total landlessness or some small land holdings is a positive determinant of rural urban migration from rural areas either family's migration or individual's migration. The land holdings coefficient is significant at 5% and 10% level in the urban as well as rural communities, respectively but land holdings coefficient is negative in the urban communities. The negative land holdings coefficient show that family migration is much more likely among small land holdings and landless household as compared to large land holdings i.e. 13 and more acres. As the possession of land increased by one acre in case of family migration, the probability of staying at origin by 0.034323. This also implies that large farmer has less tendency of migration as compared to the small farmer and marginal person. Thus, probit model result shows that land is the main source of income in the rural areas of Pakistan.

The analysis of data from eight villages suggests that high rate of out migration from a village is intimately associated with unequal distribution of resources (Usually Land). It is the main push factor in the rural areas that is empirically proved. In the rural community the individuals whose family is left behind in the villages have migrated only improve of their socio-economic status. It is empirically proved that every migrant/individual seems to

come from all income groups to seek the better economic opportunities. As the economic opportunity increase by one unit 068375, raises the probability of migration. This study also coincides with Lipton's (1980) conclusions regarding the relatively small importance of remittances as quoted earlier. He and other team members of the Indian village studies programme emphasise the inequality increasing effects of rural to urban migration. "The analysis of data from forty Indian villages suggests that high emigration from a village is intimately associated with unequal distribution of resources (Usually Land)." Kuhn (1999) concluded that land deprivation, particularly total landlessness without access to any land, is strong determinant of family migration while households with some small land holdings are likely to practice individual migration. Stark (1991) argues that relative deprivation plays an important role in migration decisions. These and several other authors in this area indicate that unequal access and ownership of land and other rural assets lead to movement from the countryside to cities in search of other opportunities. As discussed above, research in Pakistani villages suggested that high migration from villages is closely associated with unequal distribution of resources, usually land and associated assets.

H-2: The higher the rate of poverty reduction among the migrants' families in the urban areas of Pakistan, the greater will be the rural out migration.

H-3: The higher the rate of poverty reduction among the migrants' families in the rural areas of Pakistan, the greater will be the individual migration from the rural areas. A large majority of the migrants, families had improved their monthly household income in the urban as well as in the rural areas. The coefficient of monthly income after migration is significant at 1% level in the urban migrants. The marginal effect of an additional increase in the income by one unit, the probability of poverty reduction is enhanced by 000552. The result shows that better economic opportunities are the major source of attraction to these in the rural areas, which have fascinated the rural people toward the act of migration. While individual migrants whose families left behind in the rural areas have improved their monthly household by sending the remittances because the coefficient of the household monthly income after migration is significant at 10% level in the rural areas. The additional increase in the income by one unit, the probability of poverty reduction is enhanced by, 038180. Probit model result shows that rural out-migration is positively associated with objective of poverty reduction in the urban as well as rural communities. These findings are counter to a micro-level wages differentiate model study which acknowledge migration is more likely if an individual's expected destination area income, the expected wage timing, the probability of employment, are higher than current origin area income (Todaro, 1969; Harris & Todaro, 1970).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The living conditions of the villagers should be improved in terms of civic amenities, housing conditions and infrastructure. Therefore, Government and NGOs should provide the basic facilities in the rural areas of Pakistan. Government that wishes to reduce out migration should offer alternative sources of credit and insurance in the rural areas of Pakistan. The mark up percentage on the micro credit facilities, which already exist, its mark up should be reduced to tackle the poverty problem in the rural areas. Development and internal migration are closely related. There are a number of policies that can be developed to promote development while maintaining a mutually advantageous migration policy. Such initiatives should come from the business communities which greater control of world trading systems, resources, influence and a high stake in the outcome, with the co-operation of the government they should install their industries away from the big cities.

REFERENCES

- Amjad, R., 1989. Economic impact of migration to the middle east on the major asian labour sending countries- An overview' In: Amjad, R. (ed.), *To the Gulf and Back. Studies on the Economic Impact of Asian Labour Migration*, pp. 1-27. Geneva: UNDP/ILO.
- Afsar, R., 1995. *Causes, consequences and challenges of rural urban migration in Bangladesh*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Adelaide, Australia.
- Bohning, W.R., 1984. *Studies in International Labour Migration*, London: Macmillan.
- Chaudhury, R.H., 1980. *Urbanization in Bangladesh, Dhaka*. centre for urban studies, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Government of Pakistan, 1998. *Population and Housing Census of Pakistan, 1998: census Bulletin-1*. Population census organization statistics division, Islamabad.
- Government of Pakistan, 2002-03. *Economic Survey of Pakistan*, pp. 184-5. Islamabad: Economic advisor wing, finance division.
- Harris, J.R. and M.P. Todaro, 1970. Migration, unemployment and development, A sector analysis. *American Economic Review*. 60: 126-42
- IOM, 2000. *World Migration Report*. Co published by the International organization for migration and the United Nations.
- Johnson, D.G., 1948. Mobility as a field of research. *Southern Economic J*. 40: 152-61
- Kuhn, R., 1999. The Logic of letting go: family and individual migration from rural Bangladesh. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania
- Lipton, M., 1980. Migration from rural areas of poor countries: The impact and on rural productivity and income distribution. *World Develop.*, 8: 1-24
- Mincer, J., 1978. Family migration decisions. *J Political Eco.*, 8: 749-73
- Nachimias, D. and C. Nichimias, 1992. *Research Methods in Social Sciences*, pp. 386-9. (4th ed.), New York: St. Martin press.
- Stark, O., 1991. The New economics of labor migration, *American Eco. Review*, 75: 173-8
- Todaro, M.P., 1969. A model of labor migration and urban unemployment in less-developed countries. *The American Eco. Review*, 59: 138-48

(Received 09 January 2005; Accepted 13 May 2005)