The important finding of these tables in this chapter is rejection of monodimensional theories about causes of rural urban migration. Migrants in their expression pointed out that both factors - Push and Pull factors - had been the main factors in their migration although the rural push factor had been more important.

Most of the migrants are landless and agrarian, and had said that one of their main factor responsible for migration had been this factor.

Generally migrants had been landless and low percentage of them have had animal husbandry or orchard states.

Those migrants who have had agricultural land, animal husbandry and orchard estates have said that the lack of irrigation, water and fertilizer had been two important causes of their migration.

In general, factors like lack of loan, controlling plant pests and tractor had been other factors responsible for rural urban migration.
Among the socio-psychological factors, factors like lack of educational and training centres, medical facilities, hygienic public bath and hygiene had been said by migrants as important factors for their migration. Another factors like absence of electricity, pipe water supply, roads, bus services, consumers co-operative and telephones had mentioned as other factors in order.

Among pull factors following factors have been pointed out by rural migrants as important factors.

1. Socio-psychological and cultural difference between rural and urban people. (61.5%)
2. Better job facilities in urban area (57.7%)
3. Educational and training facilities in urban area (44.2%)
4. Facility for children's development in urban area (24.8%)
5. Social amenities (21.8%)
6. Athletics (18.9%)
7. More mannerful and cultured behaviour (15.8%)
After considering the main causes of rural-urban migration or main factors in rural-urban migration, it is necessary to see whether there is any selectivity in migration. This is done in the next chapter.
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CHAPTER VI

SELECTIVITY IN MIGRATION

Earlier in the first chapter it is pointed out that some studies have brought out that there is selectivity in migration. Here, in this study, we are going to prove whether cities accept all people from rural areas or there is any selectivity. With reference to the following tables it can be understood that in Rural-urban migration in Iran (to Mashhad City) there is some selectivity.
TABLE NO. VI.1

PROPORTION OF RURAL MIGRANTS (SAMPLE OF THIS STUDY) AND MASHHAD CITY POPULATION BY SEX (1986)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population of</th>
<th>Both sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population %</td>
<td>Population %</td>
<td>Population %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Migrants in</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashhad city</td>
<td>2022966</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1031141</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: I.R. of Iran, Plan & Budget Ministry, Statistical Centre of Iran, Natajie Tafsili - Shahrestane Mashhad, Statistical centre of Iran Publisher, Tehran, 1989 (TIR 1368) P.2 (Persian)

HISTOGRAM - RURAL MIGRANTS (SAMPLE) POPULATION BY SEX
The findings based on the selected sample survey of this research regarding the sex ratio of male and female migrants has been drawn out in the above table NO.VI.1, which shows that among 408 migrants (taken as a sample) 386 i.e. 94.6% are male migrants and 22 i.e. 5.4% are females. But, it is necessary to note here that the above figures indicate only the number of the main migrants and are not inclusive of their families who followed them later on. (Children, wife etc.)

It also becomes clear that the number of male migrants is 18 fold more than female migrants. These findings find a foothold in the Research Work carried out in Iran that dealt with the sex of internal migrants (rural urban migrants) which supports the above figures. e.g., in the study over land reforms done in Iran in some rural areas of Birjand, Ghasee- Shirin, Namadan, Sanandaje, Garmsar, Golpaigangan and Sari, in 1969 (carried out by researchers of "The Social Studies and Research Institute of (Tehran University) indicates that the main sector or large percentage of rural urban migrants are male as and
when compared with the ratio of females, which is comparatively low.  

The findings of this study can also be comparable to Michael Todaro's theory, who states that most of the rural urban migrants are males. According to him the different studies and research work that has been conducted in Africa and Asia support the figures of Table no. VI.1 quantitatively.

Along with this, my research findings, when compared with most of the studies carried out in many Asian Countries and even Iran, provides a similar supportive facts. The proof of the same can be viewed (Histogram No. IV- ) in the research studies of the statistical centre of Iran, as regards the arrival of rural migrants during the last 10 years to urban areas of Mashhad city, on the basis of sex and age differentiation. In a survey by the statistical of Iran, the number

---

1. See Mohammad Javad Z.M. and others, A New attitude to internal migration in Iran, Agricultural Ministry of I.R. of Iran Rural Study and Agricultural Economic Centre, Agricultural Ministry Publication, Tehran, Iran, 1985, p.17 (in Persian). Also see, Hameed A, "Factors responsible to rural migration to city centres of Iran", Plan and Budget organisation, Tehran, 1983, p. 24 (Persian)

Also see, Sarhadi f (translator), Migration, Growth of population and development, Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Study and Agricultural Economic Centre, Agricultural Ministry publication, Tehran, 1985, p.27 (Persian)

of male migrants in all age groups are more than females except in the age groups of 20-29. Also, if we deduct the number of migrants following their parents from the total percentage of migrants we find that the number of males outgrow the number of female migrants.

In association with this phenomenon it is also reviewed that the male migration of rural people especially in the age group of 10-20 years to urban areas, effects the sexual ratio status of both areas i.e. in the place of origin and place of destination, which means that there is a sort of inequality created in these areas, whereby the proportion of females increases in rural areas and decreases in urban areas (Mashhad city).

But this is not the same in all countries of Lation America and East Asian countries eg: In Phillipines, where most of the rural urban migrants are females.

Being members of the fairer sex, women accept low paid menial jobs, as house maids and factory labourers, whereby increasing the ratio percentage of their category. Another one is of San Diego (chile) where the ratio of females (ie.
100) is more when compared with male migrants (ie. only 74).  

But in a country like Iran, where most of the economic activities are concentrated in the hands of male members, the proportion of the letter will naturally outgrows the number of female migrants which is quite low.

Any how according to table No. 6.1 we can see that the percentage of male urban population in Mashhad City is 51 percent and its sex ratio is 104 (104 male for every 100 female). But from total 408 migrants 386 persons are male ie. 94.6 and sex ratio among migrants is 1754.5 which it shows that there is selectivity by sex.

3. Sarhodi F (translated) Migration, Growth of Population and development, Ministry of Agricultural Rural Study and Agricultural Economic Centre, Tehran, 1985, p.27
### TABLE NO.VI-2

**Proportion of Rural Migrants (Sample of This Study) and Mashhad City Population by Age Group (1986)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Rural Migrants</th>
<th>Urban Population</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>374299</td>
<td>18.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>706112</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35 &amp; above</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>2022966</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Histogram - Rural Migration (Sample of This Study) by Age Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

214
### Table VI - 3

**Population of Mashhad by Age Group and Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Both Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Sex Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below 1 Year</td>
<td>82666</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>41936</td>
<td>40730</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>380990</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>193939</td>
<td>187051</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>293544</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>149357</td>
<td>144187</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 14</td>
<td>183120</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>94022</td>
<td>89098</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24</td>
<td>374299</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>186648</td>
<td>187651</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 64</td>
<td>648483</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>333651</td>
<td>314832</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Yrs &amp; over</td>
<td>57629</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>30324</td>
<td>27305</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2022966</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1031141</td>
<td>991825</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ibid. P.2, Plan and Budget Ministry, Statistical Centre of Iran, "Haqooje Tafsili Mashhad, Statistical Centre of Iran Publishers, Tehran 1989 (Tir 1368) P.2 (Persian)
Table No. VI-2 gives ground to the findings that out of 408 selected migrants, 224 (54.9%) of the total sample belong to the age group of 15-24, whereas the age of 120 migrants (29.4%) of the total migrants are between 25-34 years of age. The remaining 64 migrants (15.7%) belong to the age group of 35 years and above. Findings of my research in this regard is comparable to other research finding of various countries. For Eg. Refering to same chapters of population report series under the heading of Migration, population growth and development published by Johns Hopkins University in 1981 illustrates the same fact. The reason being that migrants belonging to this category have more time for exploring facilities available in the cities. The outcome resultant of Table No.VI-2 can also be supported by statistical centre of Iran, 1986 (Histogram.1) where it is seen that most migrants arrived at Mashhad are belong to the age group of 10-19 years and 20-29 years.

Michael Todaro’s theory also lays a supportive stand to the above mentioned findings, where he states that most of the migrants are young. Research work progressively carried out in some countries like Kenya, Tanzania ..... Nigeria, India also support these results.

4. ibid., p.27
In retrospect to the earlier results that most migrants belong to the younger age group, is also supported by a study commenced by the researchers of the Demography Centre of Shiraz University which undertook the sample of 16 villages.⁶

This research study reveals that the young migrants, especially bachelors provide young blood to labour force making the city younger (labour force). But when they come to the urbanized area they bring with them the traditional values of the village which creates complications in the urban society. As their customs, ideas, language and culture is different to that of the city 34.0% of migrants that belong to the age group of under 24 years, 29.4% who belong to the age group of 25-34 years, in other words the total 84.3% belong to the overall age group of 15-34 years, who.....are suitable for hard physical labour, and odd jobs, masons, unskilled, building workers etc., This actually points out that most of the rural urban migrants are young and are capable of joining the labour force. Therefore they migrate in search of work or jobs. Therefore comparing the age group of 15-24 years, in urban area more than in rural areas for the doubtless simple reason that this pyramidal age group has migrated to the cities.⁷

---

⁷. Ibid., p.19
As it can be seen in Table No. VI-2, VI-3 out of total population of Mashhad only 18.50 percent are in 15-24 age group, whereas out of total migrants 54.9% are belong to this age group, which shows that there is selectivity by age.

**TABLE NO. VI-4**

LITERACY PROPORTION OF SAMPLE MIGRANTS, RURAL AREA AND URBAN AREA OF MASHHAD CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Literacy status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent Rural migrants</th>
<th>Percent Urban area</th>
<th>Percent Rural area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ibid., P.5

**HISTOGRAM - SAMPLE MIGRANTS STATUS OF LITERACY**
The figures of Table no. VI-4 shows that out of the total of 408 selected migrants, 41.2% had been illiterate in terms of academic achievements and 58.8% had been literate i.e. in numbers it can put as 168 migrants were at the illiteracy level and 240 were literate when we review the information supplied by the findings of Table No. VI-2 we observe that most migrants fall in the age group of 15-24 years, who remained uneducated due to the educational system of the country and lack of higher educational centres in rural areas. So much so that the literacy level of most migrants had not been more than XIIth std. Absence of educational facilities in rural areas brought with it the upsurge of unskilled labour force, with the result that migrants had not been skilled enough to be absorbed in the industrial sector in urban areas. Neither were they academically qualified to attain jobs in the public services. But they have migrated for the simple reason i.e. to get employed and or to achieve higher education. World studies based on the reports of many countries also supports this research eg. in population Report series title, "Migration, growth of population and development", 1983, published by the John Hopkins University has noted that the number of literate rural urban migrants when compared with illiterate rural people, is greater. Even, in the research conducted in 16 villages
of North India it was found that 60% literate rural people had some information of the city life and its values and had absorbed it much more faster than the 14% illiterate people belonging to the same age group as the literate ones. Michael Todaro's theory again supports these findings, who believes that an important factor leading to rural urban migration is the direct relation of migration and achieving education. This shows a clear and direct relation between migration and education. But suppose all factors of migration are counted as equal, the probability of migration among the rural literate people is more.

Not withstanding the fact that among the highly rural literates and the not so highly rural literates, the former migrate more than the latter. For eg. According to a comprehensive survey conducted in Tanzania regarding migration, the relation between education and rural urban migration showed that most of the Tanzanian rural urban migrants had passed high school (or XIIth Std.) and had migrated for academic or employment reasons.

---

Exploratory studies of Sabat and Barnum also show that there exist limited possibility of obtaining employment in cities, as jobs are restricted to those who possess good levels of skilled training or are academically qualified only.

For labourers, who have completed their period of high school (XII std) there does exist some chance of such job opportunities. But for those who are qualified only at the pre-high school level (or below XII std) job attainment is not so easy.  

These findings hold true when compared with the changing phases of the Iranian Society after Revolution and before it. In the latter phase (pre-revolution phase) primary school level or, completion of school was good enough to get a job, or at least availability of some service in the army existed. But in the present day set-up the lowest rung for seeking employment in government service is at least a Diploma (passing XII std.)

---

Unfortunately, there are not many research findings available on the specific subject of rural-urban migration. But, however, according to the study over resolutions of land reforms, conducted in rural areas of 8 cities in Iran (1969) by the researchers of the Social Research Institute of Tehran University it can be put forth that there does exist a relation between decision of migrant to migrate and the factor of literacy. This also implies that, the more literate the rural migrants may be, more is his desire to migrate, ie. we have understood from above mentioned table that most of the migrants (57% of total migrants) had been rural literate people.\textsuperscript{10}

The figures of Table No. VI-4 reject the theory of Mr. Danesh Aboulhassan who believes that most of the rural migrants are illiterates.\textsuperscript{11}

Most of the other research work findings conducted in Iran and various other theories of foreign demographers hold different opinions in reference to the relation of migration and literacy levels theory propounded by Mr. Danesh A.\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10} Mohammad Z.M. and others, Op.cit., p.88
  \item \textsuperscript{11} I.R. of Iran, Plan and Budget organization Danesh A. and others, \textit{Factors responsible for irregular rural urban migration}, Plan and Budget organization Publishers, Tehran 1983, p.23
\end{itemize}
Any how, although most of migrants are literate but according to the literacy proportion of Mashhad and comparing it with literacy proportion of migrants we can find that there is no selectivity by literacy.

From the above discussion it is found that there is some selectivity in rural urban migration in Iran. City accepts those rural people who are young between 15-24. The males are accepted more than female. Or we can say that there is selectivity by age and sex. Although the literate percentage of rural urban migrants is higher than illiterate by comparing this percentage by rural literate and urban literate people it has found that there is no selectivity by literacy.

It is important to note the impact of migration on migrants themselves on their place of migration (village) and on their place of destination (city). This is done in the next Chapter.
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CHAPTER - VII

IMPACT OF RURAL URBAN MIGRATION
IN IRAN

For knowing fully the impact of rural urban migration in Iran it is necessary to divide the discussion into three different parts.

1. Impact of rural-urban migration on migrants themselves.

2. Impact of rural-urban migration on rural area (Place of origin).

3. Impact of rural-urban migration on urban area (Place of destination).

PART I

IMPACT OF RURAL URBAN MIGRATION ON RURAL MIGRANTS THEMSELVES

For knowing in more details whether there is any impact on migrants or not, after their migration, it is better to refer to the following tables.
With reference to Table No. VII-1 it can be noted that out of 408 selected migrants as a sample, 90 migrants (22.1%) are illiterate and 318 migrants (77.9%) are literate. This means that the number of literate migrants are 3 fold time more than the number of illiterate migrants. Also it implies that (with reference to Table No. VI-4) 78 migrants who were illiterate had obtained education in urban areas i.e. after migrating to cities. These findings support the view that many migrants migrate due to the educational, training and literacy facilities available in urban areas.

In the research work conducted in 12 other countries, most migrants did express that their desire to migrate was for the continuation of higher studies. But, the primary reason of most migrants was getting employment and continuation of higher studies would follow after finding the job.¹

Todaro has also laid much emphasis on the above article whereby he states that one of the main reason for migration is to improve their education or training qualification levels.²

2. I.R.of Iran, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, Labour and Society (Kah Ra Jamash) No. 2, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, Publisher, Tehran, 1987, p.52 (Persian)
Any how one of the main important effect to the migrant is change in their literacy status after migration which in this table is clearly visible, which is a positive impact.

When migrants were asked whether they would like to go back to the villages, they replied negatively. They want to stay in urban areas and they do not want to go back. When asked, why they don't want to go back one of the reason was that, they have established families in urban area and they do not want to disturb their children. They want to expose their children to urban environment. Following table indicates their marital status after migration.
With reference to Table No.VII-2, it can be observed that from the sum total of 408 emigrant persons, 350 persons are married and 58 persons are single (i.e. 85.8% are married and 14.2% are single). Should we compare the results of this table with table No. VI.5 it will be seen that a great number of emigrants have married after migration (68.1 percent). In the event that, even half of this number would have married people residing in the city, their return to the country would clearly become difficult (it would be hard for them to return).
### TABLE NO. VII-3

NUMBER OF OFFSPRING OF MIGRANTS AFTER MIGRATION

(at the time of interview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Group No. of migrants' children</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Having 1-3 Children</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Having more than three children</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Having no children</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>408</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Histogram**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0 | 80| 160| 240| 320| 400

---
The Table No. VII-3 indicates the fact that from the sum total of 408 persons (sample emigrants), 94 persons have between one to two children. In other words, 23% of the migrated people have such number of children. 240 persons have three or more than three children. This is to say that the percentage of the emigrants having more than three children is 58.8%, and the rest, namely other 74 persons that include 18.1% of the total emigrants do not have any offspring.

Naturally, the high percentage rate of people having more than three kinds, namely 58.8% of migrants, illustrates the fact that migrants returning to the country is difficult. Because, children got used to socio-cultural and behavioural norms of city, can hardly accept or adopt difficulties existing in the place of country, dislike going back.
TABLE NO. VII.4

PROPORTION OF MIGRANTS, THOSE WHO ARE READY TO RETURN BACK WITH THOSE WHO ARE NOT READY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Decision to go back</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTOGRAM

Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Considering the above Table No. VII-4 it can be perceived that of the sum total of 408 emigrant people, 358 persons do not tend to return to the original place, (87.7%) and only 50% persons (12.3%) would tend to return to the original place (the country side).

Lack of desire to return to the country side, might indeed have lots of reasons including "city attraction", a lot of problems, short comings which may exist in the country side, or some other problems and difficulties.

With such conception in mind, the question of our interest that we remove and eliminate their shortcomings or difficulties? If we do this, are they going to change their mind or not? See Table No. VII-5 in this regard.

This lack of tendency to return to the "original place" which has been shown in the above mentioned table, is not restricted only to the "country side emigrants" coming to Mashhad. Most of the researchers conducted in different countries do substantiate this. For instance, series of reports published by John Hopkins University in 1983, on migration, population growth and development, indicate the fact that rural migrants do feel happy after the migration. They are
under the impression that life condition and their social status have been improved significantly.

Since migrants go for hard and low income jobs, they can easily find these jobs. To get these jobs is far more easier. Unemployment rate among migrants has been reported to 5-10%. Due fact, unemployment rate among migrants is less than those residing in cities. Migrants usually get jobs as: Craftsmanship, Street - sweeping labour and working as servants at houses (specially for women). In spite of the fact that jobs such as these are considered low in comparison with the standards of civic society, this transformation present causes relative income increase and improvement of their job conditions and status. 76% of the sum total of migrants in the cities of Turkey earned more than before, 12 percent just as before and only ten percent earn less than before. 3

TABLE NO. VII-5

COMPARATIVE RATIO OF WILLING MIGRANTS AND UNWILLING MIGRANTS TO RETURN TO VILLAGE

(Even all of the rural difficulties have been solved)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTOGRAM
This Table No. VII-5 illustrates the fact that out of 408 migrants had been selected in the random sample survey of which 144 migrants were willing to return to their place of origin if conditions in the (rural) areas was improved and congenial for their existence. This means that 35.3% of total migrants were ready to go back, if and when there exist rural development, which according to the migrants has been cause of their migration.

But the remaining 264 migrants i.e. 64.7% of the total selected sample had given a negative reply and were unwilling to go to their place of origin, even though conditions in their place of origin would be improved.

This percentage of unwilling migrants being more than the ones who were willing, regards greater consideration as they have migrated to their place of destination, not only due to uncongenial rural conditions but because of certain prevailing conditions in their place of destination too (Pull factors) the factors restrict their return to the place of origin.

Thus, it can be concluded that if the government restricts migration in its initial stages it will be more easier than in the later stages, which means that if certain factors are provided in the rural sector at the beginning of the migratory
flow it will inhibit migration taking huge proportions, later on.

As mentioned previously, that migration occurs not only due to problems prevailing in rural areas but that its root causes existing in cities in the shape of urban culture, customs, social and psychological factors and also the very many facilities which do not exist in rural areas, of these urbanization plays a greater role in not allowing the migrants to go back once they settle down in the cities.

Thus, it can be summed up that though government makes provisions available in rural areas, yet more than half of the rural migrants may not return. This aspect needs greater attention on the part of the government for the future as prevention (of migration) will be better than cure of the preposterous inflow of migration streams to urban areas.
TABLE NO. VII-6
MIGRANTS' PROFESSION AFTER MIGRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Profession</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jobless</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Salaried</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Farmers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other jobs</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTOGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
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<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
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With due attention to the above table, it can be observed that out of the sum total 408 sample emigrant persons, only two persons are jobless, i.e. 0.5% of the whole sample. In other words, it can be said that the percentage here is zero. Salaried persons 156, i.e. 38.5% and the number of farmers 10 persons, i.e. 2.5% of the whole emigrant persons. Other jobs 240 persons, i.e. 58.8% which includes most of the number of these persons.

Considering the above table, it can be clarified that the percentage of joblessness and farming occupation is almost zero. This is to say that, the potential of getting a job in the city of Mashhad is rather high and available for the migrant persons.

Lack of occupation in farming, too, indicates that emigrants leaving the country side, do not tend to return to farming, and therefore, a great number of them have changed their jobs. However, what attracts attention most of all is the changing of 318 farmers (place orchard estates) to 10 people. Considering other jobs, the above table indicates that the majority of emigrants choose easy independent or optional jobs.
TABLE NO. VII-7

PROPORTION OF MIGRANTS SATISFACTION AND
DISSATISFACTION OF THEIR OCCUPATION
(After migration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTOGRAM
This table indicates the fact that of the sum total of 108 sample migrant persons, ie. 26.5% from the whole sample do feel contended. Those who are content with their jobs a little reach the number of 216 persons ie. 52.9%.

Considering the above table, one can conclude that almost, the number of people contented with their jobs greatly and the number of people not contented with their jobs a little, are equal. And most cases include those who feel in between (50-50). Should we add the "50-50 content number" with "great content - number", we can observe that number of those satisfied with their jobs reaches 324 persons, ie. 79.4% of the sum total of sample emigrant persons. Of course, here, by satisfaction with the job, we mean that the person is not so inclined to go to the "original place".

This table indicates the fact that of the sum total of 108 sample migrant persons, ie. 26.5% from the whole sample, most are satisfied with their jobs and 216 persons, ie. 52.9% from the whole sample do feel 50-50%. Those who are content with their jobs a little, reach the number of 84 persons ie. 26.6%.
TABLE NO. VII-8

OWNERSHIP OF PROPERTY OF MIGRANTS IN THEIR PLACE OF DESTINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ownership/property</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Residential home</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Do not own any of the above 3 items</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>All the three</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Two items</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTOGRAM
Above table reveals that out of 408 total selected migrants 226 or 55.4% have ownership of residential homes in the city, 8 migrants that forms only 2% of the total selected migrants, own cars and 6 migrants i.e. 1.5% own shops in urban areas. Whereas 26 migrants or 6.4% possesses all the three above mentioned luxurious properties, 54 migrants i.e. 13.2% hold only two items of the mentioned properties, personally owned by them. The remaining 88 migrants that form 21.6% of the total migrants, do not own any of these items of properties.

The city of Mashhad where this research was done has become possible, ranks the second biggest city in Iran after Tehran (the capital of Iran) where along with urbanization, embedded the rising costs of residential homes and a high standard of living. Thus, the migrants who does own some kind of residential accommodation (that belong to him) should have the following two specifications:

1. He should be employed for a job that pays well, so that he can afford to pay the skyrocketing prices of residential living. And if this does become possible, he will not leave the city life easily due to his ownership of property in the urban areas.
2. Those migrants who are willing to buy a residential accommodation, which is very expensive, are investing in lesser gains. But, then it clearly means that they are not renting or buying the accommodation with the view that they are going to remain for a short period in the city. And also that their desire to return to rural areas will decrease.

It should however be kept in the mind that most of the rural migrants had migrated due to the prevailing difficulties problems in their place of origin and not because of the attraction of urban facilities. (Table No. V-1). So these migrants do not belong to the rural rich class and have migrated due to the rural push factors but not to enjoy city life but to achieve much property in the urban areas.

As noted earlier that there exists a high percentage (55.4%) of these owning residential accommodation in the city, seem to be settled permanently and are unwilling to return back to the rural areas. Along with this percentage, if the other two groups are included i.e., of those owning two or three items of property, then the problem of the return inflow of migrants becomes greater and greater. Thus, all these figures
and findings are supporting the result of Table No. VII-4 in which we have understood earlier that most of the migrants are not willing to return back to their place of origin.

In order to know why they are not ready to return back, it is better to see table no. VII-9 which shows the effect of city life to the migrants.
TABLE NO. VII-9

REASONS FOR NOT RETURNING TO THE VILLAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rural difficulties</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Family disagreement</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Different reasons</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTOGRAM

VALUE

1.00
2.00
3.00

0  40  80  120  160  200
From the above table, it can be seen that from the sum total of 408 "sample emigrants", 200 persons, i.e. 49% of the grand total of the sample, stated that: due to the existing problems and difficulties in the village, they do not tend to return to the village and thus avoid facing these difficulties.

Of the whole number of sampling persons, 94 persons i.e. 23% based this reason on family disagreement on the issue of returning, and the rest, i.e. 114 persons (27.9%) mentioned different reasons.

What is considered the most important factor here is the high percentage rate of those who because of the existing difficulties and problems in the village as reasoned by them did not tend to return to the village. Thus, one can conclude that difficulties as described by the emigrants do prevent and hinder emigrants returning to the village, and again, difficulties, indeed, play the most important role in this regard.

Next is the family disagreement problem. A careful attention to the unmarried persons before migration perfectly
illustrates that most of them got married after migration. The main point here is that these newly settled emigrants' children were born in the city, adopted civic cultural, customs and formalities, and generally got used to civic society. So, it is visible that this social effect of urban society has an important role to hinder migrants returning to the village.
### Table VII-10

**Proportion of Satisfaction of City Life**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Histogram**

![Histogram](image)
Considering the information obtained from the selected sample survey of 408 migrants, Table No. VII-10 points out that out of the total number of 230 migrants or 56.4% are satisfied with their city life but 36 migrants who form 8.8% of the total migrants, are unsatisfied from their life in the city whereas the remaining 142 i.e. 34.8% are satisfied to a little extent. When the satisfied number of migrants is summed up with those who are a little satisfied, the resultant total will be 372 or 91.2%. This percentage shows that migrants are satisfied to the extent that they have become to adjust themselves to the urban environment (i.e. city culture, customs etc.) and prefer living in cities rather than face the existing problems in rural areas. For them, phenomenon of returning to their place of origin envelopes bigger problems if the adjustment factor prevails with the rural urban migration.

From the above tables, it seems that generally there is positive impact of migration on migrants. Atleast it is their perception. They do not want to leave city even if they face some problems. Rural difficulties are always occupying their mind. In cities, they could get job, could increase income, could acquire house which was not possible for them in villages.
CHAPTER VII - PART II

IMPACT OF RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION ON RURAL AREAS
(Place of origin)

Rural-urban migration usually has effect on rural area also. This effect can be positive or negative. To know whether rural-urban migration in Iran (Mashhad city) has any impact to the origin place or not, we have to refer to the previous tables.

According to the Table VI-2 most of rural urban migrants are young and so, they are active. Migration of this age group person has a great importance to the rural area. It can be said that migration of these age group people is equal to decreasing the labour force. Of course, if migration of these young age group persons may be because of limitation of land or disguised unemployment then we can say that, migration of these persons is good but actually it is not so and we saw in chapter V that the causes of their migration were something else. Any how the first impact of migration of this age group person to the origin place us deduction of labour force.
Table No. V-8 shows that most of the migrants are farmers and so leaving village by these people means that this kind of migration has tremendous effect on agricultural production. As we know, agricultural production is the main production of Iranian Villages, and we can say village without agriculture has no meaning.

So, the other important effects of rural urban migration to the rural area (place of origin) is negative effect on agricultural land and decreasing the agricultural production.

Table no. VI-2 also shows that migration of this age group naturally has an important effect on age pyramid of rural area.

It may be said that migrants usually send some of their income to their origin place and so it has a positive effect on origin place. For example in 1960, 1/10th of total income of rural urban migrants in Accra (Capital of Ghana) were sending to the rural area (origin places of migrants) these incomes could help other investments. In Yemen, Yugoslavia and Pakistan this kind of income was used for irrigation water, garden making and Vegetable gardens. In Kenya and India this kind
of income was used for technology instrument and agricultural means on machines. Some times it was used for training etc.

According to this study in Iran (Mashhad) most of rural migrants are not sending from their income to their origin place. Following table shows it clearly.

---

TABLE NO. VII.11

EARNINGS FROM THE RURAL URBAN MIGRATION INCOME
BEING SENT TO THEIR PLACE OF ORIGIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sending</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table No. VII-II shows that out of the total 408 selected migrants for this sample survey, 70 migrants i.e. 17.2% do send some of their earnings to their relatives in the place of origin. Whereas the remaining 338 migrants i.e. 82.8% do not send absolutely any income earnings to their place of origin.

Unfortunately there has been no specific study in these areas in the country, but according to the studies attempted on the results of land reforms in rural areas of Iran i.e. Birjand, Ghasre Shirin, Hamedan, Sanandaj, Garmshar, Golpaiegan, and Sari which were surveyed in 1969 by the researchers of the "Institute of Social studies and Research" of Tehran University, indicates that only 21% of migrants were sending their income earnings to their respective villages, whereas 79% were not. Hence, the comparison of both studies i.e. of the Research Institute and my findings prove to be somewhat similar.

4. I.R. of Iran, Ministry of Agricultural, Centre of Rural Research and agricultural economic, Zahedi Mazandarani M and others A new atitude to internal migration in Iran, Ministry of Agricultural Publication, Tehran, 1985 (Persian) p.90
Any how, this table shows that these migrants are not sending from their income to the place of origin have a negative impact on villages (place of origin) as it explained before.

To know more about impact of rural urban migration in rural areas, some village leaders also were interviewed by me. Most of them believed that the following are the main negative and positive impact to the origin place.

1. Negative points
   1. Loss of economic labour forces
   2. Decline in population
   3. Decline in the rate of marriages and births
   4. Destroying those investments which are made for youth training and progress to make /ready for an active life.
   5. Destroying of agricultural lands, gardens etc., and decline in agricultural production.

II. Positive impacts
   1. More cultural and industrial relations between two places (origin place and place of destination)
   2. Migrants in the place of destination get more knowledge and experiences. They transfer this knowledge to their parents in the origin place.
Some information like new agricultural machines, water pumps, marketing (selling their production) etc., had helped domiciled rural too much.

Agricultural farmers of Libya improved their agricultural production with the help of new experience of rural urban migrants in 1960.

Migrants while returning back to their origin place in Punjab-India, they used progressed instruments like tractors, threshers etc., and they transferred the new methods of agriculture by old and traditional methods.

In Nigeria rural urban migrants not only introduced new agricultural productions but they took the lead in schools and medical, establishing after their return.5

The other way to know the impact of rural urban migration on rural area or place of origin is to refer to the research, reports and studies done by government.

1. Ministry of Interior:
The social affairs branch of Socio-political mutual assistance of this ministry had done research on trend of internal migration in Iran. In this research one chapter has been allocated to the impact of this type of migration on rural and urban areas, those impacts which are related to the rural area are as follows:

1. Distribution of population and regional divisions.
2. Boundary problems arising of evacuation of boundary's villages.
3. Existence problems in agricultural sector and lack of potential uses of facilities in different parts of the country.

II. Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs:

The Ministry had done some study over migration which among them a report entitled "Study on trend and causes of migration in Iran - 1982" has some discussion about these impacts. In this study the result of migration has been studied from two view points, first of all according to the place of emigration and secondly according to the place of immigration. Here, we are going to point
out the impact of this kind of migration on the place of emigration (original place).

A. Negative impacts:
   1. Changing in age pyramid
   2. Decrease in rate of births and marriages.
   3. Loss of prospective profits of these investments which were for youth training and preparing them for an active life.

B. Positive impacts:
   1. Increasing of labour wages, because of decreasing of labour forces.
   2. More trading and cultural relations between two places.

Overall, it seems that migration has more negative impact on the place of origin than positive one.
CHAPTER VII - PART III

IMPACT OF RURAL - URBAN MIGRATION TO THE URBAN AREA

(Place of destination)

The most important impact of rural urban migration on the urban area is increasing of labour forces and changes in age Pyramid of urban population. As we saw in table No. VI-2 most of the rural urban migrants are young and therefore active. So, rural urban migration besides increasing urban population, increases young age group of population.

Also in this kind of migration ladies increase the natural growth of population in the age of pregnancy.

Finding whether rural urban migration has effect on trend of development of Iranian cities specially Mashhad city is very difficult. Relation among urbanization, industrialization and development is very complicated and there is no study over this problem in Iran or it is very less.

For more details over this kind of migration government reports and studies can help us.
1. Ministry of Interior:
The Social affairs branch of socio-political mutual assistance of this ministry had researched on trend of internal migration (rural - urban migration) in Iran. In this research one chapter has allocated to the impact of this type of migration on rural and urban areas, which we have discussed before, the impact of this kind of migration to the rural area in last part. Now, here we are going to show its impact to the urban area, which are as follows:

1. Creation and intensive of non-conformism and social deviation.
2. Distribution of population and regional divisions.

II. Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs:
This ministry had done some research on migration which among them a study titled "study on trend and causes of migration in Iran in 1982" has some discussion. The impact of rural-urban migration on rural area from this study came in the last part and here we are going to bring the impact of rural-urban migrations on urban area as that study has pointed out. Those impacts are as follows:
A. POSITIVE IMPACTS

1. Increasing of population (urban population)
2. Using of active forces without any previous capital formations.
3. Using of migrant workers in some activities which local labour are not ready to do.
4. Competition with local workers because of acceptance of lower wages.

B. NEGATIVE IMPACTS

1. Increase in unsuitable hygienic conditions, unsuitable morals, customs and beliefs by migrants.
2. Problems created from two cultural conflict.

For more details, I have interviewed some of the government officers in Iran.

1. Interview with the Chief Commissioner of Islamic Revolution committee (Komite-ye Enghelab-e-Islami)

Summary of his viewpoint about impact of rural urban migration specially in Mashhad city was as follows:
1. Increasing social problem, because of conflict of two different cultures.
2. Migrants' crimes are more because nobody knows them in city and there is no social control over them by their family like in their villages.
4. Exploitation of them by criminal citizens.
5. Living in slum area and some other place together surrounding the city illegally.

2. Interview with Chief Commissioner of Anti-Narcotics squad and Chief commissioner of detection of anti-social crimes (Mocki Koll Mobarezech ba Nawade Mokhadder Wa Nadice Kol - Moburezech ba Monkarat) Both of them agreed that these migrants usually pull to these kind of crimes. These migrants are the main instruments for hidden crimes in the hand of some city people.

Chief commissioner of Detection of anti-social crimes expressed that in a research done by that office, it is found that among a sample included 207 prostitutes in Tehran, 119 of them had been migrants. i.e. 57.5% of total selected sample.

From the above discussion, it is clear that migration has mixed impact on urban areas: tilting more to the negative side.

** * * * * **