Migration Patterns in Pakistan: Preliminary Results from the PLM Survey, 1979

Mohammad, Irfan and Demery, Lionel and Ghulam Mohammad, Arif and Farooqui, Furqan Ahmad and Tariq, Javed and Haq, Rashida and Khan, Ghani

Pakistan Institute of Development Economics Islamabad

1983

STUDIES IN POPULATION, LABOUR FORCE AND MIGRATION
PROJECT REPORT NO. 6

MIGRATION PATTERNS IN PAKISTAN: PRELIMINARY RESULTS FROM THE PLM SURVEY, 1979

MOHAMMAD IRFAN
LIONEL DEMERY
GHULAM MOHAMMAD ARIF

Furqan Ahmed Farooqui, Javed Tariq, Rashida Haq-and Ghani Khan

PAKISTAN INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS
P.O. Box 1091, Islamabad

Project Director

Professor Syed Nawab Haider Naqvi
Director, PIDE

Project Manager

Dr. Mohammad Irfan
Chief of Research (Economics)

Project Team Members

1. Dr. Iqbal Alam, Chief of Research (Demography)
2. Mr. M. Naseem Iqbal Farooqui, Research Demographer
3. Mrs. Naushin Mahmood Qureshi, Research Demographer
4. Miss Nasreen Abbasi, Research Demographer
5. Mr. Ghulam Yasin Soomro, Research Demographer
6. Miss Zubeda Khan, Research Demographer
7. Miss Talat K. Alauddin, Research Economist
8. Mr. S. Mubashir Ali, Staff Demographer
9. Mr. H. B. Siyal, Staff Demographer
10. Mr. Khalid Hameed Sheikh, Staff Demographer
11. Mr. Ghulam Mohammad Arif, Associate Staff Economist
12. Mr. M. Javed Tariq, Associate Staff Economist
13. Mr. Ghulam Mustafa Zahid, Associate Staff Demographer
14. Miss Rashida Haq, Associate Staff Economist
15. Mr. Zafar Mueen Nasir, Associate Staff Economist
16. Mr. Sharif-ul-Haq Grewal, Research Assistant
17. Mr. Mohammad Rafiq, Senior Computer Programmer
18. Mr. Mohammad Khalid, Senior Computer Programmer
19. Mr. Furqan Ahmed Farooqui, Computer Programmer
20. Syed Tariq Ahmed, Computer Programmer
21. Mr. Masood Ashfaque, Computer Programmer
22. Mr. Javed Akbar Gil, Computer Programmer

PREFACE

The need for 'endogenizing' demographic variables in development planning is now widely recognized. The planners have to spread their analytical net wider to capture in one 'go' both the demographic and socio-economic variables. This requires an explicit recognition of the two-way link between changes in fertility on the one hand and those in labour market, wages, income distribution, consumption, savings, investment and other variables on the other. The research work done so far in Pakistan has inadequately addressed itself to this two-way linkage between demographic and socio-economic phenomena. Researchers, constrained by limitations of both data and analytical framework, have tended to study the demographic phenomenon of fertility in isolation from such related matters as labour force participation, rural-urban migration and income and expenditure patterns. These studies have failed to analyse simultaneously the demographic, production and consumption decisions of households. For instance, high fertility rates are generally attributed to biological determinants alone which can be influenced by large supplies of such clinical devices as contraceptives. Such notions about the fertility behaviour of the households have given birth to ineffective government policies. That the many population planning adventures, taking mostly the form of crash programmes, undertaken so far have foundered should not surprise anyone. Fertility, like love that sustains it, is a many-splendoured thing. It must be seen in a broader socio-economic context.

The nature of the influences of economic forces, both direct and indirect, on fertility behaviour should therefore constitute a major area of concern for social scientists and policy makers. To make a start in

this direction, the inter-linkages between such variables as fertility, labour force participation and migration and their effects on the household income and expenditure behaviour must be studied. Such a study should permit us to understand better the decision-making process of the household, which is the basic unit in both the demographic and economic analyses. Research studies of this genre have already been carried out in many other developing countries and have provided gainful insights into the determinants of household economic-demographic behaviour. However, in Pakistan the present exercise is the first of its kind.

In order to understand better the economic-demographic interface the project entitled "Studies in Population, Labour Force and Migration" has been undertaken by the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics in collaboration with the ILO and UNFPA. The project is a 'four-in-one' venture based on a national sample, the field-work for which was undertaken by the Statistics Division (formerly called Central Statistical Office, or CSO for short) covering 10,288 households. The survey generated a wealth of data on the household decision-making process concerning the behaviour of the connected foursome – viz. fertility, migration, labour force participation and income and expenditure. Every effort has been made to ensure reliability of the data. This study, which is being brought out in the form of a series of seven 'first' reports, would enhance our understanding of the behaviour of households with respect to the various ways in which they go about fulfilling their 'basic needs'. Even more important, it should lay the foundations of economic demography in Pakistan, opening up new areas of multi-disciplinary research that could not be perceived before. This study should also provide the researcher with a sufficient feel for the real world to permit formal economic-demographic modelling exercises. In this respect the present reports are truly pioneering both in intent and in purpose.

Syed Nawab Haider Naqvi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Professor Syed Nawab Haider Naqvi for his continued support, advice and encouragement. As a manager of the project, Mohammad Irfan (one of the authors) is thankful to ILO for the collaboration and UNFPA for generous funding for the execution of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Appendix Tables

I - Introduction

This report presents some preliminary findings of the PIDE project "Studies in Population, Labour Force and Migration in Pakistan" (The PLM project) which was implemented in collaboration with the international Labour Office (ILO) with funding support from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). The project is concerned with the interrelationships between various aspects of household behaviour in production and reproduction, seeking to improve understanding of decision making in fertility, family formation, migration and labour force participation at the household level in Pakistan. Since the consensus of the World Population Conference in Bucharest in 1974, and its World Population Plan of Action, governments, including that of Pakistan have been anxious to articulate more effectively the policy links between population on the one hand and social and economic development, on the other. To some extent, this objective has been constrained by a lack of data and understanding of the underlying interactions between these two sets of factors bearing on household decision making. Whilst there is no shortage of sophisticated theory, purporting to explain how behaviour is framed within the social and economic environment as well as through government policies, however tests of these theories based on sound empiricism are not common in the developing countries. Yet social policy in this area cannot be properly effective without empirically based analytical framework.

Recognizing the serious shortage of reliable data on population and development interactions, the PIDE embarked on ambitious programme of data collection and economic demographic analysis. The data so generated (details of which have been reviewed in Irfan, 1980) are in many respects unique to Pakistan. They offer a rich store for policy based study over the immediate future and it is recognized that these first reports hardly scratch the surface of their research potential. Rather, they seek to present the results of the PLM project in a broad prospective. This is a first phase of research which is expected to be followed by more intensive work, concerned with underlying socio-economic behaviour and related hypothesis testing.

Among the variety of economic demographic ramifications of relevance to policy making, migration is the most rapid of demographic responses to socio-economic change. Generally migrants move to improve their well-being, to better job opportunities and to increase their human capital. Strategies of social and economic development have profound effects on migration which often emerge with the medium term time horizons of most planning exercises (5 years). Given the predominance of urban based industrialization, it is not surprising that most recent migration literature has highlighted the role played by rural-urban migration and the importance of economic factors in its determination (Todaro 1976). The recent surge in contract migration to the Middle East and North Africa is a somewhat dramatic illustration of the wage responsiveness of labour supply and territorial mobility. Such migration responses, however, can hinder the attainment of social and economic objectives if not properly understood and anticipated.

In Pakistan official policy concern has been expressed regarding the present trends in migration and urbanization in the country. The growth of the large metropolitan areas of Karachi, Lahore and other cities has led to the adoption of a strategy to achieve a better rural-urban balance to 'slow down un-necessary and wasteful migration' to distribute urbanization more uniformly and to accelerate the growth of small towns and intermediate cities (Planning Commission, Government of Pakistan 1978, p. 181). Experience has shown however, that state policies on migration if they are to be effective, must be based on a sound understanding of the nature of migration flows, as well their determinants and consequences. For this, census data are known to have serious limitation and must be supplemented by more careful empirical enquiries at the household level. The PLM survey will go some way in meeting this need.

This paper reports some preliminary results of the PLM survey, as they relate to migration flows in Pakistan. Section II reviews the implications of the data collection methodology, and is followed (in Section III) by an analysis of the major flows of internal migration. Section IV deals separately with international migration and Section VIII draws some concluding observations. Companion papers are under preparation on the consequences of migration processes, and on the characteristics of the migrants.

II. Migration Data in the PLM Survey:

Existing data base on migration in Pakistan is not very satisfactory. The censuses for 1951 and 1961 only provide information on lifetime migration (place of birth and present residence)whereas even this information is not available from the 1971 census. For data pertaining to the 1960's, information is only available on a country-wise basis from the Housing, Economic and Demographic Survey (HED), 1973, and various labour force surveys. These limitations of census data for migration study are now fully appreciated. Their primary use is for the measurement of migration flows and the calculation of migration rates. Similar considerations apply to the HED and LFS surveys, though they are subject to the additional limitations of sampling which can be particularly troublesome in migration study (as we shall discover below).

Both censuses and national sample surveys can accommodate only limited coverage of migration phenomena. They are therefore ill suited as a basis for explaining and understanding the behavioural interactions between migration, employment and development, which require some understanding of the causes and consequences of migration. On the other hand, micro studies, though treat the subject in greater depth, cannot be generally applied, and are therefore of relatively limited use in policy prescription.

In many respects, the PLM survey is an attempt to combine the advantages of both these approaches. The survey entailed the development of a latch-on migration module which was enumerated along with the on-going Labour Force and Income and Expenditure Surveys of the Federal Bureau of Statistics (FBS). For 1979-80 the FBS had decided to conduct these surveys on the same sample of households, with the sample selection designed to yield reasonably accurate data at the provincial and national levels. The addition of the migration questionnaire module[1] considerably enriched the information from the survey as regards migration behaviour. By adopting this 'latch-on' methodology, the PLM survey could generate estimates of migration flows over a wide geographical areas (at the national and provincial levels in fact) and at the same time help in exploration of factors bearing on migration determinants and consequences. This approach to migration data collection has the added advantage of relatively low cost, since PIDE/ILO was able to utilize the existing FBS survey infrastructure that was already committed to the LFS and HIES.

Before considering both international and internal migratory flows as measured by the PLM survey, it is worthwhile reviewing the survey design adopted, and assessing its strengths and weaknesses for the study of migration. The choices available in designing the PLM migration survey were obviously circumscribed by the initial decision to latch-on a migration module to on-going FBS surveys. Understandably, room for manoeuvre was restricted most severely in relation to the sample design. But the basic approach also had specific implications for the questionnaire and other survey related issues.

---

1. Under the PLM project, a fertility questionnaire module was also latched on to the Labour Force Survey.

The Definition of Migrant:

Information on the migration status of household members is available from both the PLM migration module and the LFS on which it was latched. In the latter case, periodic migration estimates have been reported, based on present and previous residence, and duration of present residence. The LFS contained information on the reasons for migration, it did not go into any detail, which is understandable in a national sample survey of this type in which migration is not its chief focus. The need to go beyond simply measuring migration flows, and to consider also the underlying determinants and consequences of the process is the justification for fielding the additional (PLM) migration module.

Unlike the LFS, which derived its information on migration from current and previous residence, the PLM survey obtained a migration classification for each household member directly from the respondent. The latter was requested to enlist members of the household according to a five-fold classification.

- In-migrant
- Return-migrant
- Out-migrant
- Potential-migrant
- Non-migrant

The PLM migration questionnaire takes as its reference point the December 1971 war with its reference period extending over the eight years prior to the survey. This has the advantage of utilizing a key event, which can be readily recalled by the respondent, and of taking a sufficiently long reference period to increase the probability of identifying migrants in the sample, a point to which we shall return. All migrant categories refer to the last move in cases where multiple moves have occurred.

The five-fold migration classification of the PLM survey has three main advantages over the LFS treatment. Firstly, a distinction is drawn between in-migration and return-migration. Both are movements into the place of enumeration, but in the latter case, the move follows an earlier out-migration, but in the latter case, the move follows an earlier out-migration from that place. This goes some way in avoiding difficulty often encountered in migration survey design, which is the 'selectivity bias' introduced as a result of the sample selection process. Enumerating households in destination areas, i.e. the selection of in-migrants, (as in the case of LFS), tends to emphasise those who have successfully migrated and remain at the destination. Yet, from a policy perspective, it is important that the study indicates why it is that some migrants successfully settle in their new environment, whereas others do not. Although this is partly the result of the sampling method shown, the inclusion of return migration as a separate group tends to reduce the bias ~~basis~~ in the sample. These are migrants who had previously out-migrated but have returned to their origin for some reason or another. In effect, the PLM migration module has reduced this selectively bias through enumeration at the place of origin (as far as the original move of return-migrants is concerned). As we shall demonstrate the PLM questionnaire improved the survey in coverage of this group of migrants.

Secondly, the addition of the out-migrant category permits the analysis of several issues including the effects of out-migration on the household of origin, and the extent of out-migration overseas. Finally, although rather an elusive concept for a field survey of this type, the

category 'potential migrant' yields information on the migration potential within the non-migrant population, and throws light on perceptions of migration and the ways in which the decision to migrate is made.

Information collected varies according to the type of migrant and the reason of mobility for a given type. The data gathered on non-migrants were confined to a few characteristics, such as age, education, working status, marital status and reasons for not moving. In the case of potential migrants, in addition to the above characteristics, intended destination and reasons for the potential move were recorded. For in-migrant and out-migrant categories the information collected varies with the reasons for mobility. For individuals whose reasons were cited as marriage or education, limited information pertaining to their current age, education, marital status and activity was obtained. In the enumeration of remaining categories of in-migrants and out-migrants detailed information was collected on the employment status, occupation, and income before and after migration. These were supplemented with the questions on remittance sent back and money taken away at the time of move. In cases of out-migration the respondent (generally the head of the household) was asked about the perceived effects of the exodus of a household member on the household's spending and other behaviour patterns.

Sample Design:

Most of the issues which need to be settled in designing a sample for a migration study simply did not arise in the PLM survey because of the latch-on methodology adopted for data collection. The sample had already been established by the FBS for its two national surveys (LFS and

and HIES), based on an updated sampling frame derived from the 1971 Population Census. The PLM survey was conducted in two rounds[2] of the LFS sample, its size therefore being approximately half that of the LFS. Our present concern is to trace the implications of this for sampling migrants, and to assess the extent to which it was sub-optimal.

The main problem facing all migration surveys is that of locating 'rate elements', i.e., migrants. The challenge of sampling for such surveys is to guarantee that a sufficient number of migrants will be drawn in the sample. This means that random sampling techniques are relatively cost ineffective, since they yield only a small number of rare elements. Even in areas of substantial in-migration, the incidence of migrants in any random sample is likely to be low.

This has led some commentators (e.g. Bilsborrow, 1981) to conclude that incorporating a detailed migration section in a multi-purpose survey questionnaire to be applied in a random sample, will yield too small a proportion of migrants to be cost effective. It is not, however, exactly clear what 'cost-effectiveness' means in this context. If the migration questionnaire is incorporated into an existing surveys, the costs of which are committed independently of the migration component, only the additional cost should be taken into consideration. Viewed in this way, the addition of a migration module may under certain circumstances, be a relatively cheap method of obtaining migration data.

2. Although FBS uses the term 'round' to describe the phases of survey implementation, different households were enumerated for each quarter. The sample was so selected, however, to generate substatative quarterly data.

Moreover, it ought to be kept in mind that the PLM survey is not simply a migration study. It is as much concerned with fertility and labour force participation, and their interactions with other socio-economic variables. To this end, the choice of the latch-on methodology, using the LFS and HIES makes pre-eminent sense. Understandably certain subjects, and migration is probably a case in point, may be more effectively addressed through independent, purposive samples. But against this must be placed the very real advantage of comprehensiveness in a single data set.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY MIGRATION STATUS OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AND PLACE OF RESIDENCE (1972-79)

	MIGRATION STATUS OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD				
	Total	In-Migrant	Return-Migrant	Potential-Migrant	Non-Migrant
Pakistan	100.0	6.5	2.5	1.4	89.7
Urban	38.1	3.3	0.6	0.5	33.7
Rural	61.9	3.2	1.9	0.9	56.0

Source: PLM Survey 1979 (Un-weighted)

Be this as it may, it is clear from Table 1 (which reports a section of the information given in Appendix Table 1) the number of migrant households among those enumerated constitutes a very small sample size on which to base our references. Approximately 930 households enumerated in the PLM survey could be considered 'migrant', on the basis of the migration status of the household head. Such a sample drawn on a national basis must be considered small. Had the definition of migrant been confined only to

recent moves (which some commentators consider essential in order to obtain robust data not subject to recall error) the incidence of migrants would have been negligible.

Obviously, there would have been an advantage in adopting an alternative sampling design in order to obtain a larger sample of migrants. Using the life-time concept to migration, and three sampling strate (metropolitan, other urban and rural), ESCAP recommends oversampling in the areas of high in-migration (see ESCAP, 1980). Countries reviewed by ESCAP's Sample Design Manual (which did not include Pakistan) about one third of the samples recommended would be life-time migrants. If the concern of the survey were to be confined to recent migrants (say 5-years migrants), the proportion of migrants in these samples would be significantly lower and probably not a great deal higher than those achieved in the PLM latch-on survey.[3] This would suggest that more drastic departures from random sampling approaches are needed. Bilsborrow (1981) recommends a multi-stage disproportionate stratified sampling scheme. This entails the selection of primary sampling units proportional to their population size, followed by stratification and "blocking", using disproportionate sampling fractions. The latter should be directly proportional to the standard error of the estimating variable, which he takes to be the proportion of migrants in the stratum. This recommendation could not of course by accommodated within the PLM sampling framework but from the experience of the PLM survey, it could appear to be necessary in order to generate a sufficient sample of migrants.

---

3. Using HED data, some claculations were made for Pakistan using the sampling formula suggested by ESCAP (1980 Annex II) though for 5-year migrants. These yielded hypothetical sample distributions which did not drastically deviate from the FBS sample, and in our judgement would not yield significantly larger proportions of migrants than have been achieved in the PLM survey.

Questionnaire Design:

A major disadvantage of the latch-on methodology is the effect on questionnaire design in general, and on the complexity and length of the interview in particular. Although great care can be taken to minimise sampling errors, these are generally not as serious as non-sampling errors, which can assume quantitative significance for large and complex surveys. For migration research there is an undeniable conflict between keeping the questionnaire length to manageable proportions (to minimise respondent fatigue and non-sampling errors) and obtaining sufficient information to be of use for analysis. The variables (including those at the community level) that relate closely in one from or another to migration, represent a formidable list for questionnaire design. But when migration data are obtained through an on-going national sample survey, there is all the more reason to keep the length and complexity of the questionnaire to a minimum, as otherwise, the survey will overstretch the field capacity of the data gathering agency. An important objective of analysis of the PLM data will be to assess whether migration data of sufficient depth and detail can satisfactorily be enumerated on the national scale of the LFS.

Data Processing:

The use of latch-on modules in the PLM survey creates a specific and quite serious problem for data processing. If the main survey is a regular one (as in the cases of the LFS and HIES), data gathering agencies have established procedures for coding, editing and data entry into computer files. These procedures cannot readily accommodate additional questionnaires, so that separate data processing must be undertaken for the latter. In the

case of the PLM survey, the problem was compounded by the fact that PLM questionnaires were latched-on to the LFS HIES for only two of the four survey rounds. The FBS was obliged- therefore to compile the data separately, supplying a data tape for each separate questionnaire. This is a direct, though not necessarily inevitable consequence of the latch-on approach. Had a full-fledged migration survey been fielded, the processing and analysis schemes would have treated the data set in its entirely.[4]

---

4. Many of the difficulties in data processing when latch-on questionnaires involving different enumerators and respondents are used is that of inconsistent returns, both within and between questionnaires. At the individual level, there has been serious difficulty in matching the data tapes of the few questionnaires 75 percent of the households have been merged giving household level data only.

III. Migration Flows: 1972-79

Despite the limitations of the latch-on approach to migration data collection, the PLM migration data have the compensation of national coverage. Each quarterly round of the LFS was so designed as to stand on its own in providing provincial and national (quarterly) estimates of the labour force and its characteristics. The sample taken for the PLM survey (amounting to just over 11,000 households) is probably sufficiently large to draw tentative conclusions about migration patterns in the country overall and possibly by province. As should be expected in a sample survey of this nature, data can be expected to reliably indicate only the proportional distributions by broad categories. Consequently, absolute numbers of migration are not reported with any prominence - only their composition and major directions. The reader is advised to interpret these findings with caution, given the fact that the sampling procedures were not designed to yield migration flow estimates.

The objective of the PLM survey was to enhance understanding of the underlying behavioural relationships between migration and socio-economic conditions. It was not implemented for the purpose of generating national and sub-national estimates of migratory flows. The 1981 census, which has since been enumerated, will provide the most reliable estimates of these aggregates. Nevertheless, there is some advantage in taking an overview of the flows of internal (and international) migration as indicated by the PLM survey data. This 'birds-eye-view' is important for policy analysis and prescription, since it reveals major geographical patterns of migration

which can be related to macro social and economic developments. Moreover, categorisations of migration (for example, by rural/urban origin/destination, or distance) can be illuminating for social policy. Until the census results are available, LFS and PLM data offer the only information source on migration patterns during the 1970's. There are, in some respects, certain advantages of PLM over census data, even for the purpose of flow analysis. Although their geographical coverage is poorer, PLM data are more varied, making the distinction, for example, between in-migrants and return migrants, which is not feasible in the census. Moreover when matched to the main LFS and HIED data, the survey will link migration to a wide range of socio-economic variables, again not possible in the census.

This section will review migration flows as indicated by the PLM survey. This will entail identifying the incidence of migration, tracing its trends over time, and presenting origin/destination and distance analysis.

Out of the 11,000 households in the PLM sample, return pertaining to migration were available for 10,242, implying an under coverage of about 7 percent. The number of households enumerated by the province were: 6779 in Punjab, 2277 in Sind, 1200 in NWFP and 476 in Baluchistan. Whilst this distribution approximates the composition of the study universe, there was over-sampling in urban areas. The data discussed below, however are adjusted for this oversampling.

Incidence of Migration:

The distribution of the population by migration status is given in Table 2. According to the definitions of migration discussed above, 10.8 percent of the population has migrated during the period 1972-79. More than a half of the migrant population is accounted for by the in-migrant category, whilst slightly less than one thirds is defined as out-migrant. Of the latter, one eighth left Pakistan (81% to the Middle East and 19% elsewhere). Return migration constituted only one tenth of the migration stream during the reference period. Of this three quarters originated from within Pakistan, the rest entirely from the Middle East. Similarly most of the in-migrant stream was confined to Pakistan, although 2.5 percent of in-migrants came from abroad - mostly from Bangladesh.

In overall terms, the incidence of migration is higher among females than males, especially in the rural areas (see Table 3). A greater proportion of urban males were classified as migrant compared with their rural counterparts, whereas the opposite applies to the incidence of female migrants. This can be explained by the important role played by marriage in determining migration flows. Marriage as a reason for changing residence has been cited at the place of destination (in-migrants) and origin (out-migrants). Using these responses it is estimated that 31 percent of total migration falls under this category. Given the patri-local marriage custom in the country, a significant proportion of female migration is for marriage. The share in the total female population categorized as migrants falls from 11.6 percent on 4.8 percent, when migration for marriage is excluded (Table 3). It is more striking in the case of rural female, where migration for

Table-2

Percentage Distribution of Population of all Ages by Migration Status, Sex and Rural-Urban Category 1972-79.

Migration Status	Both Sex			Male			Female		
	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban
All	100	72.66	27.34	51.37	37.27	14.10	48.63	35.395	13.235
1. Non-Migrant	88.38	64.16	24.22	45.60	33.09	12.51	42.78	31.07	11.71
2. Potential Migrants	0.82	0.65	0.18	0.59	0.45	0.14	0.23	0.20	0.03
3. Return Migrant	1.09	0.91	0.18	0.75	0.62	0.13	0.34	0.29	0.05
4. In-Migrant									
i) Including Migration for marriage within Pakistan	5.92	3.94	1.98	2.43	1.50	0.93	3.49	2.44	1.05
ii) Excluding Migration for marriage within Pakistan	4.30	2.69	1.61	2.43	1.50	0.93	1.87	1.19	0.68
iii) From abroad	0.15	0.04	0.11	0.07	0.02	0.05	0.08	0.02	0.06
5. Out-Migrant									
i) Including Migration for marriage within Pakistan	3.31	2.72	0.58	1.56	1.35	0.21	1.75	1.38	0.37
ii) Excluding Migration for marriage within Pakistan	1.66	1.41	0.25	1.53	1.32	0.21	0.13	0.09	0.04
6. Out-Migrant abroad									
i) Middle East	0.39	0.24	0.15	0.37	0.23	0.14	0.02	0.01	0.01
ii) Other Countries	0.09	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.015	0.005

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

marriage constitutes more than three fifths of the residence changes reported by females during the reference period.

Table: 3

INCIDENCE OF MIGRATION BY SEX AND PLACE OF ENUMERATION WITH AND WITHOUT MIGRATION FOR MARRIAGE

(Percentage)

	All Migration			Excluding Migration for Marriage		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Rural	10.0	11.7	10.8	9.9	4.5	7.3
Urban	10.3	11.2	10.8	10.3	6.0	8.2
Total	10.1	11.6	10.8	10.0	4.8	7.5

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

In the foregoing discussion, migration to and from abroad has been included. We shall now confine our attention to internal migration, defined as those who moved within Pakistan devoting section IV to a review of international migration. Our first objective is to derive an indicator of the prevalence of internal migration within the country. The aggregation of in-migrants and return-migrants would appear to be the most appropriate measure, since the inclusion of out-migrants would be tantamount to double counting. Every in-migrant or return-migrant to a household must have out-migrated from another household in the country. On the other hand, it will be argued later that rural-urban migration is usually under enumerated in surveys of this type, relying on sample frames derived from an earlier census. It is possible that the inclusion of the out.migrant category

would give a more accurate picture of migration incidence. Although for comparability we shall take column 3 in Table 4 as an indicator, the matter is discussed in greater detail below.

Bearing in mind that the data refer to all movements during the 1972-79 period, it does not appear that the population of Pakistan is particularly prone to internal migration. About 7 percent of the population is classified as migrant (as indicated in column (3) A),[5] 1 percent being return migrant. If migration for marriage is excluded, the incidence of migration is significantly reduced. Roughly 5 percent of the population has migrated since 1972 under this definition. In-migration and return-migration are higher in urban than rural areas, as would be expected. This is even more marked when female migration for marriage is excluded.[6]

Among the provinces of Pakistan, a higher incidence of in-migration is recorded for both rural and urban Punjab than the rest of the country. Urban NWFP also appears to attract a relatively higher proportion of in-migrants. Low rates were recorded for Sind and (especially) Baluchistan. Similar considerations apply to out-migration as regards the incidence of migration in the provinces, except that urban Baluchistan appears to be a more popular destination as measured by incidence of out-migration.

The migration incidence and pattern observed in the PLM data are more or less corroborated by information from the LFS of 1979 (see Table 5).

5. These proportions will differn from those presented in Table 2, above since they refer only to internal migrants.

6. Out-migration data, reported in the table[12] confirm the dominance of urban areas as destinations of internal migration in the country. This applies regardless of whether migration for marriage is included or not. Interestingly, the dominance of urban areas of destination is much more pronounced in the data on out-migration than it is for in-migration and return-migration.

Although the samples are similar (LFS data being drawn from four quarters, whilst PLM covering only two), the PLM estimates of the incidence of migration are somewhat higher, due to the longer reference period. The major inconsistency between the two data sets is the figures reported for urban Baluchistan, which was significantly lower in the PLM survey. This difference is probably due to sampling errors, and should be subjected to further investigation.

Table: 4

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY MIGRANT STATUS PROVINCE DESTINATION AND RURAL/URBAN AREAS: 1972-79

Province		In-Migrants A	In-Migrants B	Return-Migrants A*	(1) + (2) A	(1) + (2) B	Out-Migrants A	Out-Migrants B
Pakistan:	Total	5.92	4.30	0.99	6.91	5.29	3.31	1.66
	Rural	5.43	3.71	1.17	6.60	4.80	1.97	0.32
	Urban	7.23	5.88	0.52	7.75	6.40	6.83	5.19
Punjab:	Total	7.12	4.93	1.12	8.24	6.05	3.35	1.49
	Rural	6.67	4.37	1.25	7.92	5.62	2.23	0.37
	Urban	8.55	6.68	0.73	9.28	7.41	6.13	4.95
Sind:	Total	3.82	3.50	0.32	4.14	3.82	2.70	1.97
	Rural	2.77	2.58	0.51	3.28	3.09	0.74	0.19
	Urban	5.33	4.82	0.04	5.37	4.86	5.52	4.53
NWFP:	Total	4.97	3.35	1.86	6.83	5.21	4.76	2.00
	Rural	4.36	2.76	1.92	6.28	4.68	3.08	0.35
	Urban	8.06	6.34	1.55	9.61	7.89	13.22	10.31
Baluchistan								
	Total	1.10	1.00	0.50	1.60	1.50	2.11	1.48
	Rural	0.80	0.80	0.62	1.42	1.42	0.22	1.11
	Urban	2.30	1.81	0.06	2.36	1.86	9.59	6.91

Female migration for marriage is included in Column A and excluded in Column B. Data refer to internal migration only.

* Return migration for marriage is negligible.

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

There are more similarities than differences also in a comparison of PLM findings with those of earlier surveys. Evidence of migration during the late 1960's and early 1970's is available from two major sources - the Housing, Economic and Demographic Survey (HED) of 1973 and the Labour Force Survey (LFS) of 1974-75. The latter, according to the data of Table 5, indicates a similar migration pattern to that observed in the late 1970's by the PLM survey. It does, however, suggest slightly higher urban in-migration, particularly in Punjab and NWFP. The incidence of migration recorded in the HED is significantly lower than the other sources. Overall, 4.1 percent of the population migrated during the period 1965-73 according to HED, compared with 6.6 percent recorded in the LFS 1974-75. In the most other respects, however, the pattern is similar with in-migration to urban areas dominating, especially in Punjab and NWFP. Again, the major departure from the PLM survey is reported in-migration into urban Baluchistan, which was higher than any of the other sources reported in Table 5.

It is interesting to note the low incidence of migration recorded in the 1981 census (10% count) in Table 5. This records only 4.09 percent of the population as having changed residence during 1971-81. Not only is this figure lower than that recorded in the PLM survey, but it refers to a longer period. The main explanation appears to be in the enumeration of rural migrants particularly in Punjab and NWFP. For urban areas the estimates are similar (bearing in mind that the reference period is two years shorter in the PLM than the census count). It does appear, however, that PLM estimates of the incidence of migration are on the high side for urban Punjab and on the low side in urban Sind and Baluchistan.

Table 5

INCIDENCE OF INTERNAL MIGRATION* - A COMPARISON BY RURAL/URBAN CATEGORY AND PLACE OF DESTINATION

Province	SOURCE/PERIOD				
	HED Survey 1965-73	LFS, 1975 1971-75	PLM Survey 1972-79	LFS, 1979 1975-79	1981 Census (10% count) 1971-81
Pakistan	4.08	5.59	7.01	6.38	4.09
Rural	3.77	5.22	6.60	5.93	2.51
Urban	4.88	9.80	7.75	7.53	7.95
Punjab	4.15	7.39	8.24	7.36	3.97
Rural	3.36	5.70	7.92	6.82	2.79
Urban	6.63	12.20	9.28	9.02	7.10
Sind	4.72	4.80	4.14	4.63	5.04
Rural	7.09	3.04	3.28	3.96	2.04
Urban	1.59	6.44	5.37	5.42	8.49
NWFP	2.81	7.45	6.83	5.69	3.00
Rural	1.79	6.53	6.28	5.31	1.87
Urban	7.51	11.35	9.61	7.46	9.29
Baluchistan	2.51	0.91	1.60	1.82	3.91
Rural	1.47	0.43	1.42	1.02	1.95
Urban	8.06	3.69	2.36	5.44	14.54

* In-migrant and return migrant under PLM definitions and immigration from FATA, KASHMIR, TRIBAL AREAS and other countries is excluded.

Source: PLM Survey 1979, Federal Bureau of Statistics (1982), Statistics Division (1974), Statistics Division (1976).

Pattern of Migration Flows:

A comparison of migration incidence yielded by PLM with other data sets, made above, reflects a reasonable degree of correspondence between various sources. Pattern of migration flows contained in PLM are discussed below. Since we are concerned to establish pattern of migration, the double counting problem due to inclusion of out-migrants does not apply. Out-migrants are therefore added to other two categories in-migrants and return-migrants for ascertaining the pattern of flows.

The flows of internal migrants, defined as in-migrant, return-migrant and out-migrant excluding[7] female migration for marriage, by province of origin and destination are summarised in Table 6. The flows are further divided into the following 'distance' categories: Short distance migrants, defined as those who move within the district:, medium-distance migration, which has reference to movements within the province but between districts; and long-distance migration which is defined as inter-provincial. Although there are inevitable limitations in the use of arbitrary boundaries for classifying migration flows in this way, this three-fold division of flows is a fair representation of relative distance.

7. The exclusion of female migration for marriage in the PLM enumeration of in-migrants and out-migrants imposes a constraint on the flow data. Whilst codes given in the household enumeration form of the PLM migration questionnaire permitted the identification of such migrants at the place of enumeration and their inclusion in the data on the incidence of migration (as described in the preceeding section) our analysis of migration by origin and destination cannot include this category because previous place of residence for in-migrant female who moved for marriage was not transcribed by Federal Bureau of Statistics in data processing. However, through the inclusion of a 'marriage' code in the out-migration section of the questionnaire, it has been possible to present origin/destination out-migrant flows both inclusive and exclusive of female migration for marriage. This will enable us to make some judgement whether these follow similar patterns to non-marriage flows.

TABLE 6

INTERNAAL MIGRATION FLOWS IN PAKISTAN (1972-79) BY PROVINCE OF ORIGIN/DESTINATION AND DISTANCE* (PERCENTAGE) (ALL AGES)

BOTH SEXES

Province of Destination	PROVINCE OF ORIGIN																
	PAKISTAN				PUNJAB			SIND			NWFP			BALUCHISTAN			
	Total	Short	Medium	Long	Total	Short	Medium	Total	Short	Medium	Total	Short	Medium	Total	Short	Mediu	
Pakistan	100	41.94	39.61	18.45	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Punjab	67.39	32.57	30.73	4.09	63.30	32.57	30.73	1.59	-	-	2.345	-	-	0.16	-	-	
Sind	20.48	5.02	4.56	10.10	6.66	-	-	10.33	5.92	4.56	3.19	-	-	0.25	-	-	
NWFP	10.84	3.50	4.13	3.21	2.694	-	-	0.494	-	-	7.63	3.50	4.13	0.02	-	-	
Baluchistan	1.29	0.05	0.19	1.05	0.61	-	-	0.30	-	-	0.13	-	-	0.25	0.05	0.19	

Note: 1) Short Distance : 1) Intra-district (or within district) migration

2) Medium Distance: 2) Inter-district and intra-province migration

3) Long Distance : 3) Inter-province migration

*Migration defined as in-migrant, return-migrant and out-migrant (excluding migration of females for marriage)

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

Table 6 indicates that around four-fifths of internal migration has taken place within provinces, that is, over short and medium distances. Short distance migration has the largest share (42 percent)whilst only 18 percent of Pakistanis migration during 1972-79 was inter-provincial. Given that the costs of migration increase with distance, this pattern is to be expected. Moreover had migration for marriage been included in these flows, the predominance of short distance migration would undoubtedly be more marked. This is clear from Table 7 which reports the distribution of migrants by category. A comparison of the distribution of out-migrants including and excluding migration for marriage, indicates that short distance migration assumes greater significance in the former category. This is especially true for female migrants, 48 percent migrated within the district when migration for marriage is included, (only 6 percent migrated outside the province under this definition). Clearly the share of short distance female migration would have been significantly higher in all migration categories had migration for marriage been included.

Table 7 also shows that males migrated over longer distances than females, and that distances measured among the in-migrant category appear to be smaller than the other migrant categories. Whereas inter-provincial migration accounts for 18 percent of total migration, only 9 percent of in-migrants are long distance movers. An explanation for this may be found in the rural/urban direction of the flows recorded in the various categories, reported in Table below. As we shall show rural/ rural migration is typically over shorter distances, and this migration flow is greater evidence among in-migrants compared with other categories.

TABLE 7

INTERNAL MIGRATION BY SEX TYPE OF MIGRANT AND DISTANCE:1972-79

	All Migrant Excluding Migration for Marriage			In-Migrant Excluding Migration for Marriage			Out-Migrant Excluding Migration for Marriage			Out-Migrant Including Migration for Marriage			Return Migrant		
Distance	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Short	38.5	48.9	41.9	38.5	71.5	50.0	21.4	33.6	22.3	22.6	47.6	41.1	36.5	48.0	40.3
Medium	39.7	39.4	39.6	54.3	15.0	40.4	40.3	42.2	40.0	40.0	36.5	39.4	35.0	39.4	36.0
Long	21.8	11.7	18.5	7.2	12.7	8.8	38.3	24.2	37.1	37.4	5.9	20.5	27.7	11.0	22.9

Source: PIM Survey 1979.

By breaking down the migration flows into four periods, Table 8 shows that there is some evidence from the PLM survey that migration is becoming longer distance in nature. During the first two years of the reporting period 85 percent of total internal migration was within provinces. By the final two years of the period, this share had fallen to 77 percent.

Table: 8

INTERNAL MIGRATION OVER TIME, BY DISTANCE OF MOVE*

Year of Migration	DISTANCE			
	All Distance	Short Distance	Medium Distance	Long Distance
1972-73	100	45	40	15
1974-75	100	45	39	17
1976-77	100	40	43	17
1978-79	100	40	37	23

* In-migrant, return-migrant and out-migrant, excluding female migration for marriage.

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

Analysis of migration by distance would be incomplete without reference to its rural and urban direction. The relationship between distance and sector of origin/destination is clearly brought out in Table 9. A. Whereas only 5 percent of rural to rural migrants cross provincial boundaries, almost 30 percent of rural to urban migration occurs over long distances. In fact, short distance migration accounts for less than 9 percent of rural/urban migration. Given the predominance of females among short distance migrants noted above, it is no surprise to observe in Table 10

Table 9

DIRECTION OF INTERNAL MIGRATION*
IN PAKISTAN BY DISTANCE CATEGORY

(Percentage)

A. 1972-79 — All Ages/Both Sexes

Origin/ Destination	Total (%)	Short Distance	Medium Distance	Long Distance
Total	100	42.08	40.32	17.60
Rural to Rural	41.33 (100.0)	25.48 (61.65)	13.75 (33.27)	2.09 (5.06)
Rural to Urban	29.77 (100.0)	8.96 (30.10)	12.02 (40.38)	8.79 (29.53)
Urban to Urban	14.96 (100.0)	2.30 (15.37)	8.77 (58.62)	3.89 (26.00)
Urban to Rural	13.94 (100.0)	5.34 (38.31)	5.78 (41.46)	2.82 (20.23)

*In-migration return migrant and out-migration, excluding female migration for marriage

Source: PLM Survey 1979

B. 1965-73

Origin/ Destination	Total (%)	Short Distance	Medium Distance	Long Distance
Total	100	80.4	11.9	7.7
Rural to Rural	41.5 (100.0)	34.8 (83.8)	4.8 (11.6)	1.9 (4.6)
Rural to Urban	11.7 (100.0)	8.3 (70.9)	2.0 (17.1)	1.4 (12.0)
Urban to Urban	39.2 (100.0)	31.9 (81.4)	3.9 (9.9)	3.4 (8.7)
Urban to Rural	7.6 (100.0)	5.4 (71.0)	1.2 (15.8)	1.0 (13.2)

Source: HED 1974 (Derived from ESCAP 1982, Table 1)

That most female migrants are in the rural to rural category. On the other hand, whereas only 16 percent of female migrants were rural to urban in contrast over one thirds of male migration falls in this category. The PLM data therefore clearly shows the predominance of females among the short distance, rural to rural migrants (which would be even more marked had migration for marriage been included) and the importance of rural to urban migration over longer distances, for male migrants.

Table: 10

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INTERNAL MIGRANTS* BY SEX AND RURAL URBAN DIRECTIONS

Direction	1972-79		
	Both Sexes	Male	Female
Rural to Rural	41.3	35.8	52.4
Rural to Urban	29.8	36.4	16.4
Urban to Rural	13.9	13.5	14.8
Urban to Urban	14.9	14.3	16.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Defined as in Table 8
Source: PLM survey 1979

Evidence from the PLM survey indicates that migration flows have become increasingly rural to urban over time. (Table 11) urban to urban and (especially rural to rural flows appear to have diminished during the 1970's. This is consistent with the finding reported above, that migration is becoming increasingly long distance.

Table: 11

INTERNAL MIGRATION BY DIRECTION OVERTIME

Year of Migration	All	Rural to Rural	Rural to Urban	Urban to Urban	Ru Urban to Rural
1972-73	100	43.13	25.06	17.29	14.52
1974-75	100	48.36	24.57	13.55	13.51
1976-78	100	42.44	27.37	17.52	12.67
1978-79	100	32.66	38.42	13.35	15.57

The patterns described above are quite different from those reported in the HED survey. (Reproduced in Table 9-B) HED data indicate a much more pronounced predominance of short distance migration, which seems to apply as much to rural-urban migration as to rural-rural migration. A disquieting feature of HED in fact is the negligible sectoral deviation in migration distance. Moreover, the HED survey reports a much lower share in total migration of rural to urban migration, which it places at 11 percent, compared with 30 percent in the PLM survey described above. On the other hand HED indicate a surprisingly large share of urban to urban migration (just under 40) which is also in striking contrast to the PLM fundings reported in Table 9-A.

Obviously only some of these differences can be explained by the exclusion of migration for marriage from PLM data, since this would mainly affect only rural-rural migration. The share of rural-rural migration and its distribution across distances do not differ significantly between the two surveys. The main explanation would appear to lie in the inclusion of out-migration in

PLM data. Table 12 reports the rural/urban direction of migration under different categories of migration as adopted in the PLM survey. The type of flows enumerated by each category of migrant are quite different. The in-migrant category, which is usually adopted in household surveys like the LFS and HED, is comprised of 53 percent rural to rural, 19 percent rural to urban, 16 percent urban to urban and 11 percent rural to urban. The return migrant category captured far fewer rural-urban migrants and significantly more urban to rural migrants. Finally, the out-migrant category appears to be dominated by rural-urban migrants.

If out-migrants are excluded from the PLM data, the pattern which emerges is quite different. Table 13 reports the PLM estimates of rural/urban flows by distance under this alternative definition, comparable with HED and LFS. The resultant picture is somewhat closer to the HED survey, with a much reduced incidence of rural-urban migration. Urban-urban migration, however, remains modest in comparison with the HED findings. However, a comparison of the HED pattern with that observed in other countries gives rise to serious doubts as to whether a country like Pakistan would be expected to experience such high levels of urban to urban migration. These levels were not experienced even in the most industrialised countries of East Asia. (See Table 13).

Table-12

Internal Migration Flows by Rural/Urban - Origin/Destination (1972-79) Both Sex/All Ages.

Rural/Urban Origin/ Destination	Out-migrant excluding for marriage	Sex ratio	Out-migrant including for marriage	Sex ratio	In-Migrant excluding for marriage	Sex ratio	Raturn migrant	Sex ratio	Out-Migrant excluding+ In-migrant excluding+ Return-Mig.	Sex Ratio
All	100	11.69	100	0.89	100	1.31	100	2.00	100	2.02
Rural-Rural	11.82	6.61	39.20	0.17	53.23	1.24	39.79	1.55	91.07	1.39
Rural-Urban	73.59	18.34	43.19	4.33	18.98	1.55	2.82	1.26	30.03	4.32
Urban-Urban	12.26	6.54	13.47	0.66	16.51	1.20	11.67	2.65	14.75	1.72
Urban-Rural	2.34	2.04	4.14	0.28	2.04	11.28	45.92	2.45	14.15	1.86

Source: PLM Survey 1979

Sex Ratio= Male/Female

Table: 13

DISTRIBUTION OF INTERNAL MIGRATION* BY DIRECTION AND DISTANCE, 1972-79

Origin/ Destination	Total (%)	Short Distance	Medium Distance	Long Distance
Total	100	48.20	39.15	12.65
Rural to Rural	50.61	31.16	16.72	2.73
Rural to Urban	15.83	7.68	6.14	2.01
Urban to Urban	15.56	2.53	9.11	3.92
Urban to Rural	18.00	6.83	7.18	3.99

* In-migrant (excluding migration for marriage and return migrant)

Source: PLM Survey, 1979

The exclusion of out-migrants from the PLM enumeration noticeably affects the results. Whether or not the pattern located in Table 13 is to be prefered to that of Table 9-A (in which all migration categories are included) is open to doubt. Some may argue that the inclusion of out-migrants is tantamount to double counting. That out-migrants are comprised mainly of rural-urban migrants simply means that rural-urban flows will be double counted, inflating the estimates and its share in the total. On the other hand, it is likely that conventional procedures of national sample surveys tend to underenumerate rural-urban migrants, since they rely on enumeration at the urban place of residence. Given the nature of the migration process, a typical listing of households drawn from a previous census on which the sample is based, will not give sufficient coverage to urban migrant households. Areas, especially squatter settlements, where in-migrants reside are usually inadequately represented (if included at

Table 14

DIRECTION OF INTERNAL MIGRATION IN ASIAN COUNTRIES

	Total	Urban to Urban	Urban to Rural	Rural to Urban	Rural to Rural
South Asia					
Pakistan (HED 1965-73)	100 (100)	39.2 (45.5)	11.7 (8.0)	7.6 (21.3)	41.5 (25.2)
Pakistan (PLM 1972-79)	100	14.96	13.94	29.77	41.33
Bangladesh (1974)	100	11.0	40.2	1.6	47.2
India (1966-71)	100	13.9	16.2	8.7	61.2
South East and East Asia					
Malysia (1970 Estimate)	100	33.1	15.3	12.3	39.3
Philippines (1970-75)	100	32.5	19.9	15.3	32.3
Republic of Korea (1965-70)	100	34.3	42.2	8.9	14.7
	100	10.6	12.4	6.1	70.9

Source: HED (1973), PLM (1979), ESCAP (1982 Table 1)

1) Taken from Skeldon (17). This refers to life time migrants.

Figures in parenthesis refer to internal migration during 1965-70 (Table 13 HED)

all) in the household frame based for such sample surveys. For this reason, the sampling methods adopted in both HED and LFS surveys would tend to lead to an undernumeration of rural-urban migrants when migrants are only enumerated at the place of destination (as in-migrants or return-migrants). The PLM enumeration of out-migrants involving the enumeration of rural-urban migrants at the place of origin, is a ready solution to this problem. For this reason, in our view the PLM flows reported in Table 9-A are to be prefered, since the under-enumeration of rural-urban migrants has been corrected though the inclusion of the out-migrant category.

Table 13 introduces another interesting feature of the PLM migration definitions. The incidence of urban to rural migration appears to be greater under this treatment of the PLM data. It is instructive to make a comparisons of the PLM flows summarised in Table 13 with those reported by the LFS 1979, since the samples are very similar, the PLM being latched on to a half of the LFS sample. Adjusting the reference period of the PLM data to that of the LFS a comparison of the two survey results is given below:

Table: 15

RURAL/URBAN DIRECTION OF MIGRATION*: 1975-79

	PLM Survey 1979 (%)	Labour Force Survey 1979 (%)
Rural To Rural	49.55	54.31
Rural To Urban	15.44	15.38
Urban To Urban	15.55	17.58
Urban To Rural	19.46	12.73

* In-migrant and return-migrant

Source: PLM 1979, LFS, 1979.

The surprising feature of Table 15 is the much higher share of urban to rural migration in the PLM survey.[8] This is most likely to be the result of the method of enumeration, rather than to minor sampling differences. LFS enumeration is based on present and previous residence responses, whereas PLM data were obtained directly from the respondent. The return-migrant category was explicitly enumerated, and it is certain that this has improved the enumeration of this groups of migrants. Under residence type calculations, it is possible that a number of returnees are not properly listed as migrating from another place, perhaps due to the short duration of previous residence. The decision of using the return-migrant category, however, increases the probability of correct enumeration of this type of migrant. Moreover it was observed in Table 12 that most return migrants were urban-rural in direction and conversely, nearly a half of urban-rural migrants were classified as return-migrants. The enumeration procedures of PLM, in improving the coverage of return-migration, have resulted in a larger measured flow of urban to rural migration. In fact the data in Table 15 suggest that according to the PLM survey net migration; if one adheres to LFS definitions, [and from Table 13, 1972-79] was urban to rural, for the country as a whole. However, just as PLM has been more efficient in capturing return, urban-rural migration, so, by the inclusion of out-migrants, it has a better coverage of rural-urban migration. In the net flow analysis reported below, PLM data include all categories of migrant, and demonstrate a net rural to urban flow.

---

8. The high incidence of rural-rural migration is due to the inclusion of female migration for marriage in the LFS.

Rural to Rural Migration:

As previously mentioned, rural to rural migration is the largest of the four gross migration flows we have distinguished, accounting for over 40 percent of total migration. In some respects it is difficult to understand why this category of migration has not received more attention in the literature, which has tended to devote most of its pages to rural-urban migration. There are understandable reasons why the latter is considered important (being linked to economic transformation and urbanization). But as rural-rural flows most likely consist of the country's poorer groups, a strong case can be made for a more careful study of this category.

Most rural-rural migration appears to have been directed towards Punjab province (71%) and Sind province (21%) (See Appendix Tables 3-6). PLM data indicate only slight inter-provincial movements among rural-rural migrants. For example 97 percent of such migrants from Sind remained within the province. The only quantitatively important exception to this is the flow from rural Sind to rural Punjab, which amounted to 11 percent of rural-rural migration from Sind.

Rural to Urban Migration:

Rural-urban migration has been the main pre-occupation of the development literature. As we have seen, this is not because it is the most quantitatively important of the migration flows, since in most countries (of Asia at least) rural to rural flows predominate. The importance of rural-urban migration derives from its close association with economic transformation and with the transfer of the country's labour force from

agriculture to non-agriculture. Moreover, it has significant implications for social policy and physical urban planning. The evidence reviewed above indicates that rural-urban flows are becoming more important in recent years in Pakistan.

In comparison with other moves, rural to urban migration has certain distinguishing f eatures. In the first place, it is comprised mainly of males, who account for around two thirds of rural-urban flows. It is unlikely that this would be much affected by the exclusion of migration for marriage. Secondly as previously observed, a relatively large fraction of rural-urban migrants cross provincial boundaries, with two thirds of such migrants from NWFP, one thirds from Baluchistan and one fifth from Punjab ending up in other provinces. An exception is Sind, which absorbed 93 percent of its own rural-urban migrants - a testimony to the attraction of Karachi among urban destinations in Pakistan. Sind province also attracted 45 percent of rural-urban migrants from NWFP, 59 percent from Baluchistan and 16 percent from Punjab. Male rural-urban migration is more likely to be inter provincial than that of female migration. For example, a quarter of male rural-urban migration from Punjab was outside the province, as compared to only 8 percent of female migrants.

Urban-Urban Migration

The existence of a number of urban centres in Pakistan has meant that urban-urban migration is not as quantitatively insignificant as elsewhere, accounting for nearly 15 percent of total migration. Urban-urban migrants appear to move over similar distances to their

rural-urban counterparts. Among urban-urban migrants from Punjab, for example, almost a quarter left for other provinces and 35 percent of such migrants from Sind were inter-provincial.

Urban to Rural

This stream is the least quantitatively important among the four classifications identified, and is reflective of labour circulation rather than migration. A high incidence of return migrants was observed among this migration flow indicating that most of these migrants were of rural origin initially. Urban-rural migrants are divided more or less equally between the sexes. The evidence regarding distance among urban-rural migrants is mixed across the provinces. Whereas both Punjab and NWFP retain significant proportions of such migrants (84% and 79% respectively) Sind and Baluchistan retain relatively few (48% and 41% respectively).

Net Migration Flows By Province

Table 16 reports the provincial migration balance sheet as recorded by the PLM survey. This gives the net as opposed to gross, flows of migrants of all categories. Although rural to rural migration was established as the most important gross flow, the net flow is predominately rural to urban, amounting to 18 percent of the total migration flow during the 1972-79 period. The rural areas of all provinces except Baluchistan increased losses in net terms, whilst all urban areas registered net gains. The greatest loss is recorded for rural Punjab, which along with NWFP, experienced net losses in their migration balance sheet. Sind has noticeably gained as has urban Punjab.

Interestingly, a comparison between the net flows of males and females reveals more differences in this direction. Punjab is a net gainer of female migrants at the expense of Sind and NWFP. In the case of male migrants, Sind is a net gainer at the expense of Punjab and NWFP. The net flow of females from Sind (mainly rural) to Punjab (mainly urban) is a little surprising, bearing in mind the exclusion of migration for marriage from these measures. A closer perusal of the data by migrant type suggests that this flow consists largely of return migration, from rural Sind to urban Punjab.

Table 16

NET FLOWS OF INTERNAL MIGRATION* BY PROVINCE AND RURAL/URBAN CATEGORY (1972-79)

	Total Inflow	Total Outflow	NET FLOW		
			Both Sexes	Male	Female
Pakistan	100	100	-	-	-
Rural	55.2	73.17	-17.95	-23.03	-2.39
Urban	44.78	2-.83	17.95	23.03	2.39
Punjab	69.07	71.48	-2.41	-4.62	1.26
Rural	41.48	53.57	-12.09	-16.76	-0.62
Urban	27.59	17.91	9.68	12.14	1.88
Sind	18.40	15.52	3.88	6.71	-0.57
Rural	6.73	9.24	-2.51	-1.87	-3.11
Urban	11.67	5.28	6.43	8.58	2.54
N W F P	11.27	13.19	-1.92	-2.61	-0.69
Rural	6.54	9.95	-3.41	-4.47	1.04
Urban	4.73	3.24	1.49	1.86	-1.73
Baluchistan	1.26	0.81	0.45	0.52	0
Rural	0.47	0.41	0.06	0.07	0.29
Urban	0.79	0.40	0.39	0.45	-0.29

*In-Migrant, Return migrant and out-migrant (excluding migration for marriage).

Sources: PLM 1979.

IV. International Migration 1972-79

An analysis of population mobility in Pakistan would not be complete without reference to international migration. The country's former colonial ties, combined with its location on the border of a resource rich region, have meant that Pakistanis have a relatively high propensity to travel abroad. Data collected under the PLM Survey migration module[9] offer an invaluable and in some respects unique opportunity to assess international migratory movements in the country, and their impact on the domestic economy and the society. Their uniqueness arises in the first place from the separate enumeration of out-migrants, retur-migrants and in-migrants. The survey, therefore, can provide estimates of return migrants from overseas as well as the extent of emigration. Moreover, by adding the PLM migration module to the labour force and income and expenditure surveys, a wide range of information is obtained about the migrants and their households.

The sample selection for the PLM survey as mentioned already was not specifically designed for this particular sub-group of interest (i.e. international migrants), and similar considerations to those reviewed in the internal migration section apply in this case. No over sampling of areas of out-migration was accommodated in the sampling design. The sample allocation cannot be considered optimal and it is not certain that the sample size is large enough to give a measure of reassurance that reasonable national and subnational estimates may be derived. But to reiterate a point made previously, the main objective of the PLM survey was not so much the generation of

9. The Labour Force Survey (LFS) questionnaire only covered in-migrants, and yielded no information on Pakistanis presently abroad.

national or sub-national estimates, but rather to examine the underlying behavioural economic and demographic relationships.

PLM International Migration Estimates

Overall, 3.2% of the households enumerated in the PLM Survey were reported as having at least one person currently abroad with a larger proportion of urban (4.1%) than rural (2.5%) households. Just over ninetieth of these households had only member abroad, 5.5% reported two members and 1.5% had three members overseas.

Table 17 reports the estimates of out-migration derived from the PLM survey. Of the Pakistanis who emigrated since 1972, about 394,000 were still abroad at the time of the survey, which is the estimated net out-flow for the 1972-79 period. The majority of these emigrants (80%) were reported as having left for Middle Eastern countries, whilst rural areas appear to be the most prominent origin (60%). About a half of all emigrants have emigrated from a rural areas in Pakistan to the Middle East.

In terms of absolute numbers, the Punjab is the major province of origin. Nearly two thirds of migrants presently overseas and about a half of the emigrants in the Middle East originated from this province. However, bearing in mind the distribution of the total population (given in the final column of Table 17) these figures do not represent a disproportionate share of migrants. In relative terms, the propensity to outmigrate seems to be highest in NWFP, where the share of out-migrants is almost double that of the total population. Similarly, a disproportionate share of migrants comes from urban areas, even though in absolute terms most migrants are from rural origin.

Table-17

PLM ESTIMATES OF OUTMIGRATION ABROAD (1972-79) BY PROVINCE OF PREVIOUS RESIDENCE AND RURAL/URBAN CATEGORY

	Out-migrants Abroad: All Countries		Out-migrants Abroad: Middle East		Share in Total Population(1981 Census)
	(000)	%	(000)	%	%
Punjab					
Rural	140.48	35.6	127.39	32.3	41.8
Urban	99.69	25.3	78.75	20.0	15.9
Total	240.17	60.9	206.14	52.3	57.7
Sind					
Rural	0	0	0	0	13.2
Urban	43.19	11.0	31.14	7.9	10.0
Total	43.19	11.0	31.14	7.9	23.2
N W F P					
Rural	81.15	20.6	58.96	15.0	11.3
Urban	12.59	3.2	9.58	2.4	2.0
Total	93.74	23.8	68.54	17.4	13.3
Baluchistan					
Rural	12.49	3.2	7.33	1.9	4.5
Urban	4.56	1.1	2.60	0.6	0.8
Total	17.05	4.3	9.93	2.5	5.3
Pakistan					
Rural	234.12	59.4	193.72	49.1	71.0
Urban	160.03	40.6	122.03	31.0	29.0
Total	394.15	100.0	315.75	80.1	100.0

Note: Estimates are arrived at by multiplying the numbers with ratio of Pakistan's Population (1979) with Survey Population.

Source: PLM (1979)

A surprising feature of these findings is the relatively low incidence of migration from Sind. No emigration from rural Sind was observed (a point to which we shall later return) whereas only 11% of total migration emanated from the province's urban households. Given the location in Sind of the country's major port of entry and exit, Karachi, a higher incidence would have been reasonably expected. If true, this would suggest that prospects for securing an overseas assignment are not particularly greater in the main city of access (as for example, is often suggested in the cases of Manila in the Philippines and other capital cities of the region).

Return migrants from abroad are reported by province of present residence in Table 18. It is estimated that approximately 92396 Pakistanis returned home during the period 1972-79. Nearly 76% returnees recorded by the survey came from the Middle East. Interestingly, about 45% of the returnees from Middle East took up residence in urban areas. This compares with only 31% of Middle-Eastern out-migrants originating in urban areas (See Table 17). On the assumption that out-migrants and return migrants are no different in other respects, it appears that the migration experience increases the likelihood of urban residence - return migrants who were formerly of rural origin prefering to take up residence in towns and cities. The evidence is admittedly somewhat circumstantial, and requires further investigation.

About a half of the returnees took up residence in the Punjab, which is the same proportion recorded for outmigrants. A much larger proportion of migrants returned to Sind (17%) than left the province to abroad (11%), suggesting a tendency for overseas migration to

Table: 18

RETURN MIGRATION FROM ABROAD BY CURRENT PROVINCE OF RESIDENCE
1972-79

Current Place of Residence	Number	MIDDLE EAST COUNTRIES		ALL OTHER COUNTRIES		ALL COUNTRIES*	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
PUNJAB	Rural	22649	36.55	9781	32.15	32430	35.10
	Urban	13317	21.49	5082	16.70	18399	19.91
	Total	35966	58.04	14863	48.85	50829	55.01
SIND	Rural	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Urban	13289	21.44	2172	7.14	15461	16.73
	Total	13289	21.44	2172	7.14	15461	16.73
NWFP	Rural	9634	15.55	13390	44.01	23024	24.92
	Urban	1395	2.25	0	0	1395	1.51
	Total	11029	17.80	13390	44.01	24419	26.43
BALUCHISTAN	Rural	1687	2.72	0	0	1687	1.82
	Urban	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	1687	2.72	0	0	1687	1.82
PAKISTAN	Rural	33970	54.82	23171	76.16	57141	61.84
	Urban	28001	45.18	7254	23.84	35255	38.16
	Total	61972	100	30425	100	92396	100

Source: PLM survey 1979.

cause a second stage migration to Sind province. This is likely to be related to the fact that the major port of exit and entry (Karachi) is located in the province since all Sind returnees are urban residents. Indeed, some disquiet is caused by the fact that no returnees are recorded for rural Sind, nor for urban Baluchistan. Few explanations can be offered other than sampling errors, to which we shall return.

Estimates of out-migration and return-migration to and from abroad by year of migration (i.e. the year of the latest move) are reported in Table 19. Care must be taken to interpret the table. This gives the year of latest move of the current stock of outmigrants and return migrants, i.e. of those identified as out-migrants or return migrants at the time of the survey. The data given for each year should not therefore, be taken as estimates of annual flows.

An important feature of the data presented in Table 19 is the rapid increase in return-migration. The clustering of observations at later years may be attributed to recall error in earlier years, or simply to the fact that there is considerable turnover in the stock of migrants with only the latest move being recorded. It is arguable that these considerations would apply equally to out-migration and return migration.[10] On this basis, it is interesting to observe that return migration has increased, both in absolute terms (column 3) and in relation to the numbers outmigrating to the Middle East (column 4).

---

10. It is unlikely that recall error would have as much of an effect on return-migration data (enumerated at the place of present residence) as on out-migration, which is recorded at the place of previous residence.

Table 19

PLM ESTIMATES OF OUT-MIGRATION ABROAD AND RETURN MIGRATION BY YEAR OF MIGRATION, 1972-79

	Out-Migration Abroad		Return Migration from Abroad	(3) ÷ (1)
	All Countries	Middle East	All Countries*	
	1	2	3	4
1972	7,019	5,491	.2462	.35
1973	3,855	2,459	1325	.34
1974	17,203	9,332	1454	.08
1975	33,674	25,328	2683	.08
1976	42,841	31,811	3475	.08
1977	89,320	74,367	4318	.05
1978	85,512	68,393	32162	.38
1979	114,726	90,511	44518	.39
1972-79	394,150	307,692	92396	.23

*67% return flows recorded in the Survey are from the Middle East.

Source: PLM Survey, 1979.

Whereas those who returned in 1975 represented only 8% of those who were recorded as out-migrating that year, the ratio increased to 38% in 1978 and to 39% in 1979. The indications are clear - whereas in the early and mid 1970's return migration was relatively negligible, by the end of the decade, return migration has become qunatitatively important.

Comparison With Other Estimates and Assessment of Data Reliability:

How do the results of the PLM survey compare with other estimates of international migration? In the light of this comparison, how reliable are these data? There are two broad approaches to measuring overseas migration from the country, firstly the stock/flow method, which combines time series data on flows with base year stock information; secondly the use of direct estimation of the overseas stock through household surveys. The PLM data afford a combination of both methods - its 'stock' data relate to net flows over the period 1972-79, and have to be combined with base year stock estimates to give an approximation of the current stock.

1972 is a convenient base year in stock/flow calculations given the frequently cited stock estimate of 689,000 by Pakistan's missions abroad. Reliable flow data are hard to come by, the best available being the official estimates cited in the Pakistan Economic Survey 1981-82 and reported here in Table 20. Summing the gross outflows and assuming no return migration gives a stock estimate of 1,477,474 for 1981. To the PLM stock estimate of 1,003,150 for 1979 may be added the officially reported outflows for 1980 and 1981 (as given in Table 20), yielding a 'PLM' stock estimate of 1,289,628 in 1981. The difference between the two figures (amounting to 187,846) can only partly be explained by the neglect of return migration in the

Table 20

OFFICIAL ESTIMATES OF OVERSEAS MIGRATION

Year	Private (Overseas employment promotors)	Public	Direct	Total
1971	3,340	194	-	3,534
1972	3,359	1,171	-	4,530
1973	7,654	4,646	-	12, 300
1974	14,652	1,676	-	16,328
1975	21,766	1,311	-	23,077
1976	38,516	3,174	-	41,690
1977	77,664	2,606	60,175	140,445
1978	78,685	3,246	47,602	129,533
1979	80,615	3,058	34,586	118,259
1980	91,482	17,114	24,801	133,397
1981	119,711	821	32,549	153,081

Source: Pakistan Economic Survey, 1981-82

stock/flow approach using official data. This was estimated for the period 1972-79 to be 64,668 by the PLM survey. Taking this into account gives an alternative official stock/flow estimate of 1,412,806 for 1981, which remains significantly higher than the figure indicated by th PLM survey.

Whilst the stock estimate based on official stock/flow data is higher than the PLM findings, there are reasons to believe that official flow data are even on the low side. Apart from their neglect of illegal migration, official time series do not include directly recruited migrants before 1977. It thus appears that the estimate of 1.4 million based on the stock/flow with some adjustment for return migration, should be considered to be an underestimate. Presumably illegal migrants would be more likely to be recorded in the PLM survey than in officialstatistics, which places the PLM 1981 stock estimate of 1.2m very much on the low side.[11]

A likely cause of this under-enumeration of outmigrants in the PLM survey is the problem of recall error, which is certain to affect the reliability of information provided on earlier years. Comparing official flows with the PLM data suggests that for recent years at least, PLM estimates are reasonably reliable. If it is assumed that most return migrants since 1978 emigrated after 1977, an estimate of the gross outflow between 1977 and 1979 from the PLM survey would amount to some 343,947. This compares with the officially recorded gross outflows

---

11. 1972 stock estimates are common to both sets of calculations. It is possible that thisfigure may be inaccurate though the direction of bias is hard to establish.

of 388,237. Although there is some evidence of under enumeration in PLM data, its extent is significantly less for these later years. The implication of this comparison is that recall errors (i.e. under-estimation for earlier years) may be a serious weakness of PLM data.[12]

From the available evidence, it is difficult to judge in which direction the recall error will affect the stock estimate. If it affects mainly return flows, there are grounds for more confidence in the PLM stock estimate. IN this case, the official stock/flow data should be revised downwards, since they neglect return migration. On the other hand, if the relatively low incidence of return-migration recorded in the PLM survey is reasonably accurate, it would appear that stock estimates based on official outflows would not be too far off the mark, and would most probably be under-estimates. It follows that PLM data would then be subject to under-enumeration especially in recording earlier outmigration flows.

The second method of deriving stock estimates is through the use of a household survey. This, of course, is similar to the approach adopted in the PLM estimates, except that PLM data refer only to 1972-79, and therefore, contain a 'flow' element (i.e. data refer to the stock of 1979 which 'flowed' within the period 1972-79). Two main additional survey type sources are presently available, with which we may compare the PLM estimates. First, the Pakistan Institute of Public Opinion (PIPO) Survey of 1979, which was the basis of calculations made by the PIDE International Migration Project[13]. On the basis of various

---

12. Official flow data for 1972-77 are not sufficiently reliable to make a similar comparison for the earlier years fo PLM enumeration.

13. See. I. Gilani, et al, 1981

assumptions, an estimate of 1.79 million Pakistanis abroad in 1979 was derived. This is substantially higher than the PLM result.

Adding to this the official estimate of the 1980/81 flows, the stock esitmate for 1981 becomes 2.08 million. In the assessment of the PIPO survey, the ILO/ARTEP report suggested that if anything, this estimate was on the low side. This is because the PIDE estimations are based on assumptions of average household size which appear too high and because important areas of out-migration were not included in the PIPO survey. However, since the ILO/ARTEP report was published, data from a second major source - the 1981 census, - have become available. These are reported in Table 21, which is based on a 10% sample. According to this estimate, around 1.708 million Pakistanis were abroad in 1981, having left the country over the past 10 years.

The inevitable conclusion to be drawn from these comparisons with the three major alternative estimates is that the PLM survey data on international migration underestimate the true values. In all liklelihood, there are two main factors responsible for this. Firstly, the aforementioned recall errors in the PLM survey appear to be particularly applicable to early flows out of the country. Secondly the presence of sampling errors has almost certainly led to under-enumeration of out-migrants overseas. This jusdgement is based mainly on the data presented in Tables 13 and 14 above. Zero entries out-migration from the return-migration to rural Sind, and return migration to urban Baluchistan, suggest that the sample selection procedures are quite inadequate for the purpose in hand - i.e. measuring emigration.[14] This is not to suggest

14. According to the 1981 Census, 12.5 percent of total out-migrants abroad came from rural Sind.

Table 21

NUMBER OF PERSONS MIGRATED ABROAD DURING THE LAST 10 YEARS

	Total	From Urban Localities	From Rural Localities
Pakistan	1,708,539 (100)	294,079 (17.2)	1,414,460 (82.8)
N W F P	591,405 (34.6)	35,768 (2.1)	555,637 (32.5)
Punjab	735,285 (43.0)	158,763 (9.3)	576,522 (33.7)
Sind	300,354 (17.6)	87,335 (5.1)	213,019 (12.5)
Baluchistan	77,126 (4.5)	9,280 (0.5)	67,846 (4.0)
Islamabad	4,369 (0.3)	2,933 (0.2)	1,436 (0.1)

Source: 10% sample of 1981 census data.

however, that the data are unreliable for other purposes. They will prove extremely instructive for in-depth investigation of a wide range of important policy relevant issues, such as foreign exchange remittance use, effect on income distribution, and so on. These are analysed in the comparison papers.

Overseas Stock of Pakistanis:

The assessment made in the previous section of the PLM data on international migration begs an important question. Whilst it showed that the PLM survey was probably subject to underenumeration due to recall error and sampling errors, no attempt was made to calculate the most likely stock of overseas Pakistanis.

Reference has already been made to the alternative sources of estimates of international migration from Pakistan. For convenience, these are summarised in Table 22. Our review highlighted the weaknesses of two methods used to obtain these estimates - the stock/flow method and the household survey method. But the recent information provided by the 10 percent count of the population census can be regarded as the most reliable, because of its sample size and its wide coverage, the entire country. The reported number of persons gone abroad during the last ten years still living outside at the time of the census count is estimated at 1.709 million. The main difficulty with the census estimates is that it does not include those whose duration of stay overseas extended beyond the 10 years. Whilest independent estimates of the 1972 stock are available (Zulaikha Zar-18) placed the stock at 689,000 in 1972), neither these

Table 22

PAKISTAN'S MIGRANT ABROAD - VARIOUS ESTIMATES

Source	No. of Migrants (Stock)	Reference Year
1. World Bank	205,800	1975
2. IMF	500,000	1977
3. Ministry of Labour & Manpower	1,120,000	1979
4. Bureau of Emigration & Overseas Employment	489,000	1977-79
5. Nazir Ali	640,000	1978
6. M. Akram	1,200,000	1978
7. Z. Zar	1,500,000	1978
8. Gilani	1,790,000	1979
9. PLM	1,400,000	1981
10. Population Census (10% count)	1,709,000	1981

Source: 1 World Bank EMENA-DED Study
2. IMF Survey, Volume 7, No.17 September 1978.
3. Pakistan Economic Survey, 1981-82. It is not absolutely clear whether the year referred to is 1981 as according to the survey the figures refer to recent estimates.
4. Bureau of Emigration and Overseas Employment Emigration Statistics of Pakistan Manpower, Ministry of Labour & Manpower,, Islamabad.
5. Nazir Ali "Manpower Export Impact on Pakistan's Economy" Economic Outlook, August 1978.
6. M. Akram, 'Home Remittances, 'Business Records, Feb.2,1978.
7. Z. Zar "External Migration of Labour from Pakistan, "Overseas Employment Corporation Ltd. Govt. of Pakistan, Karachi 1978.
8. Gilani. Internal Migration - PIDE Research Report.

sources nor the census data give any indication of what proportion of this stock remained overseas until 1981. In order to derive an estimate of the 1981 overseas stock, the 1981 census estimate must be adjusted by the 1972 stock, less an estimate of the returnees from the 1972 stock. Unfortunately, there is no information on return migration of this specific sub-group of pre 1972 out-migrants.

The 1972 stock data, and the 1971-81 flow data (from 10 percent census count) have been adjusted to obtain a more reliable indication of the 1981 stock of overseas Pakistanis. These adjustments have relied to some extent on the information provided by the PLM survey. The following assumptions and procedures from the basis of our calcuations:

i- The stock observed for 1972 is taken as the base figure.

ii- The net out-flow reported by the 10 percent census count, is adjusted to cover the 1972-81 period. It is assumed that the net-flow of workers during the nine months (March-December 1971) is 50,000 - being one third of the annual average out-flows for the 1972-73 period.

iii- The base year stock figure is devided into workers and dependents and region of destination using Shahid's ratio (13).

iv- The 1972-81 net flows are broken down into workers and dependents, and region of destination using the PLM survey data which refer to the 1972-79 net out-flows.

v- Return flows from the 1972 stock are estimated on the basis of PLM observations, and information provided in Sarageldin et al (1981). From the evidence of 1975 based-years data, Serageldin et al have suggested that Pakistani migrants at the time were generally accompanied by dependents. Since the majority of these comprised migrants who were already in the countries of employment in 1972, it is reasonable to conclude that the migration upto 1972 was quite different from the contract migration observed since 1973. The 1972 migrant stock is unlikely to be subject to the same rate of attrition as has been observed

b

for post 1973 migrants. The observations made by Serageldin, et al, that Pakistani population in the Middle East is under-going a certain demographic evolution and is more permanent in nature, appears to apply more to the 1972 stock than to the 1972-81 flows, which according to PLM data, are not characterised by high levels of dependency.

On the basis of observed return-migration recorded by the PLM, we shall assumed that 4.5 percent of the 1972 stock had returned by 1981, reflecting the more permanent nature of pre 1973 migration. It must be emphasised that the calculations of returns from the 1972 stock do not make a material difference to the overall 1981 stock estimate.

The estimated number of Pakistanis abroad is given at 2.317 million in 1981. This amounts to approximately 2.8 percent of the population. The estimated number / of workers is 1.647 million, which is approximately 4 percent of the working work-force. Whilst in 1972, less than one thirds of the country's out-migrants were in the Middle East and North Africa, the same has risen to over two thirds by 1981.

An interesting feature of the calculations is the low incidence of the migration to the MIddle East dependents. According to PLM estimates, only 1 percent of out-migrants to the MIddle East and North Africa were dependents. On the basis of this information, the ratio of workers to total migrants i.e. the crude activity rate for migrants to Middle East rose from 20 percent in 1972 to 89 percent in 1981. This contrasts with the projections of the World Bank EMENA Study (see Serageldin, et al, 1981) which reports a crude activity rate of 58 percent in 1975 (the base year of the study) and projects a decrease to 28 percent in 1985. According to PLM flow data, very few dependents appear to be migrating to the Middle East, which brings into question the reliability of the World Bank projections.[15]

15. For an assessment of the World Bank EMENA study utilizing sending country data see Demery 1983.

Interpolating the EMENA study projections, yields a 1981 stock estimate of 367,580 Pakistani workers in the MIddle East and North Africa. From the view point of Pakistan data this would appear to seriously under-estimate the true situation which according to our calculations, is about four times the estimate.

It would be difficult to avoid the conclusion based on this review of the alternative overseas Pakistani migrants, that a considerable number (in excess of two million) are presently overseas, and that a substantial proportion of these are in the MIddle East.

Table: 23

ESTIMATED STOCK OF PAKISTANIS ABROAD (000)

	Stock 1972	Net Out-Flow 1972-81	Estimated Return Flow from 1972 Stock	Stock in March 1981
TOTAL	689	1659	31	2317
(a) Worker	138	1524	15	1647
(b) Dependents	551	135	16	670
M.E COUNTRIES				
Total	200	1393	14	1579
(a) Workers	40	1378	4	1414
(b) Dependents	160	15	10	165
ALL OTHER COUNTRIES				
Total	489	266	17	738
(a) Workers	98	146	11	233
(b) Dependents	391	120	6	505

V- Concluding Observations:

This paper has described the main migration flows as evidenced by the PLM migration survey. The survey was not necessarily designed for this purpose and there are some indications (especially with regard to overseas migration) of under-enumeration. There are, however, a number of important lessons to be drawn from the exercise regarding the enumeration of the migrant population (apart from the more obvious sampling implications). Firstly, the inclusion of the out-migrant' category in the survey has increased the measured incidence of rural-urban migration which it can be argued is subject to underenumeration in most surveys which adopt a census based sampling frame of households. Secondly the explicit probing regarding 'return migration' embodied in the PLM questionnaire has increased the measured incidence of urban-rural migration, even in comparison with the LFS 1979 and 1981 census, which were based on a very similar sample and survey methodology in most other respects. The inclusion of these categories is perfectly feasible in large scale 'national' migration survey of migration flows.

The PLM survey also indicates that internal migration in Pakistan is becoming increasingly long distance and rural to urban in its orientation. This probably is to some extent related to the rapidly increasing flows of international migration to the Middle East, which appear to originate mainly from rural Pakistan. There is some evidence that international migration has induced a measure of internal migration, with migrants of rural origin returning to urban areas of Pakistan. On estimate of the stock of Pakistani workers overseas (Placed at about 2 million altogether) suggests that the phenomenon has attained a sufficient dimension to have

measurable impacts on the domestic economy and society. A comparision paper is currently under preparation on the consequences of migration.

There is little doubt that from the point of view of measuring migration flows in Pakistan, the PLM migration exercise has been worthwhile. The PLM migration data have not produced estimates of migration flow that are necessarily more reliable than other sources. The 1981 Census, of course, will provide the most reliable information on migration in the 1970's. But the survey does offer some particularly interesting insight into the enumeration of migrants in national household survey, which should be accomodated in data collection methodology in future surveys in Pakistan.

Appendix Table: 1

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY MIGRATION STATUS AND CURRENT PLACE OF RESIDENCE 1972-79.

BOTH SEX/ALL AGES

Current Place of Residence	All Migrant	In-Migrant Excluding for Marriage	Return Migrant Including from Abroad	Return Migrant from Abroad Only	Potential Migrant	In-Migrant Due to Marriage	Non-Migrant	Out-Migrant Excluding for Marriage	Out-Migrant Including for Marriage	Out-Migrant from Middle East	Out-Migrant from Other Countries	In-Migrant from Abroad
Pakistan	100.00	4.30	1.09	0.08	0.82	1.62	88.38	1.66	3.31	0.39	0.09	0.15
Urban	27.33	1.61	0.16	0.04	0.18	0.37	24.22	0.25	0.58	0.15	0.04	0.11
Rural	72.66	2.69	0.90	0.04	0.65	1.25	64.16	1.41	2.72	0.24	0.05	0.04
Punjab	100.00	4.90	1.22	0.07	0.51	2.19	86.78	1.94	3.86	0.40	0.09	0.08
Urban	24.41	1.63	0.21	0.03	0.14	0.46	21.13	0.29	0.65	0.15	0.04	0.04
Rural	75.58	3.30	1.01	0.04	0.37	1.74	65.65	1.65	3.21	0.25	0.04	0.04
Sind	100.00	3.50	0.40	0.08	1.24	0.32	93.47	0.29	0.84	1.53	0.06	0.38
Urban	41.09	1.98	0.10	0.08	0.17	0.21	38.01	0.10	0.40	1.53	0.06	0.38
Rural	58.90	1.52	0.30	0	1.07	0.11	55.46	0.18	0.44	0	0	0
NWFP	100.00	3.35	2.03	0.13	1.23	1.62	84.65	3.38	6.23	0.81	0.08	0
Urban	16.56	1.05	0.27	0.02	0.44	0.28	13.65	0.38	0.73	0.11	0.01	0
Rural	83.44	2.30	1.76	0.11	0.79	1.33	71.00	3.01	5.50	0.70	0.06	0
Baluchistan	100.00	1.00	0.57	0.07	2.49	0.09	94.43	0.45	1.00	0.40	0.01	0.19
Urban	17.69	0.36	0.01	0	0.03	0.09	16.98	0	0.09	0.10	0.01	0
Rural	82.31	0.64	0.56	0.07	2.46	0	77.45	0.45	0.90	0.29	0	0.19

Source: PLM Survey 1979

Appendix Table: 2

PROVINCIAL PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS (OUT-MIGRANT EXCLUDING FOR MARRIAGE + IN-MIGRANT EXCLUDING FOR MARRIAGE + RETURN-MIGRANT) BY TYPE OF MOVE: 1972-79 ALL AGES/BOTH SEXES

Current Place of Residence	PREVIOUS PLACE OF RESIDENCE														
	Rural to Rural					Rural to Urban					Urban to Urban				
	Punjab	Sind	NWFP	Baluchistan	All	Punjab	Sind	NWFP	Baluchistan	All	Punjab	Sind	NWFP	Baluchistan	All
All	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Punjab	96.98	11.38	5.81	0	71.1	77.46	7.05	21.52	7.05	60.7	77.43	31.32	36.42	5.54	62.7
Sind	2.57	86.02	4.14	0	21.2	15.54	92.95	44.96	58.67	27.7	19.95	64.52	9.91	80.02	23.8
NWFP	0.37	1.62	90.05	100	7.4	5.21	0	32.05	0	9.7	6.85	2.15	52.60	0	12.3
Baluchistan	0.08	0.98	0	0	0.3	1.79	0	1.49	41.33	1.9	0.77	2.01	1.07	14.44	1.2
	Urban to Rural														
All	100	100	100	100	100										
Punjab	84.16	34.17	16.57	47.95	64.5										
Sind	5.16	48.31	3.65	0	12.9										
NWFP	8.51	17.07	78.85	10.84	20.5										
Baluchistan	2.11	0.45	0.92	41.21	2.1										

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

Appendix Table: 3

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OUT MIGRANTS INCLUDING FOR MARRIAGE BY PROVINCE BY ORIGN/DESTINATION AND RURAL/URBAN 1972-79

Province of Origin	Province of Destination: Pakistan			Punjab			Sind			NWFP			Baluchistan		
	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban
Pakistan	100.00	43.34	56.66	63.39	31.84	31.55	19.42	3.13	16.28	15.19	8.20	6.99	2.00	0.16	1.83
Rural	82.39	39.20	43.19	53.30	28.85	24.46	14.70	2.68	12.01	12.80	7.57	5.23	1.59	0.10	1.48
Urban	17.61	4.14	13.47	10.09	2.99	7.09	4.72	0.45	4.27	2.39	0.63	1.76	0.41	0.06	0.35
Punjab	73.06	32.54	40.51	60.55	31.55	28.99	8.26	0.64	7.62	3.13	0.23	2.90	1.11	0.11	1.00
Urban	12.25	3.10	9.14	9.47	2.90	6.57	1.75	0.07	1.68	0.75	0.08	0.68	0.27	0.06	0.21
Rural	60.81	29.44	31.37	51.08	28.66	22.42	6.51	0.57	5.93	2.39	0.15	2.22	0.84	0.05	0.79
Sind	6.08	2.25	3.82	0.14	0.05	0.09	5.91	2.21	3.70	0	0	0	0.03	0	0.03
Rural	3.15	1.82	1.33	0	0	0	3.15	1.82	1.33	0	0	0	0	0	0
Urban	2.93	0.43	2.50	0.14	0.05	0.09	2.76	0.38	2.37	0	0	0	0.03	0	0.03
NWFP	19.91	8.49	11.42	2.68	0.24	2.44	4.97	0.28	4.68	12.06	7.97	4.09	0.20	0	0.20
Rural	17.57	7.89	9.68	2.23	0.19	2.04	4.79	0.28	4.51	10.42	7.42	3.00	0.13	0	0.13
Urban	2.34	0.68	1.74	0.45	0.05	0.40	0.18	0	0.18	1.64	0.55	1.09	0.07	0	0.07
Baluchistan	0.95	0.05	0.90	0.10	0	0.10	0.28	0	0.28	0	0	0	0.65	0.05	0.60
Rural	0.86	0.05	0.81	0	0	0	0.25	0	0.25	0	0	0	0.61	0.05	0.56
Urban	0.09	0	0.09	0.10	0	0.10	0.03	0	0.03	0	0	0	0.04	0.00	0.04

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

Appendix Table: 4

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OUT-MIGRANTS (EXCLUDING FOR MARRIAGE) BY CURRENT AND PREVIOUS PLACE OF RESIDENCE 1972-79

ALL AGES/BOTH SEXES

Previous Place of Residence	CURRENT PLACE OF RESIDENCE														
	PAKISTAN			PUNJAB			SIND			NWFP			BALUCHISTAN		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
PAKISTAN	100.00	85.84	14.16	56.16	45.62	10.53	28.28	26.70	1.58	12.76	10.89	1.87	2.80	2.63	0.17
Urban	14.50	12.25	2.34	7.37	5.81	1.56	4.28	4.02	0.26	2.44	1.99	0.45	0.49	0.43	0.06
Rural	85.41	73.59	11.82	48.78	39.81	8.97	24.00	22.68	1.32	10.32	8.90	1.41	2.31	2.20	0.11
PUNJAB	73.46	62.79	10.67	51.48	41.26	10.21	14.26	13.83	0.43	5.69	5.53	0.15	2.03	1.86	0.16
Urban	10.72	9.17	1.55	6.64	5.21	1.42	2.57	2.57	0.0	1.15	1.09	0.06	0.35	0.28	0.06
Rural	62.75	53.62	9.13	44.84	36.04	8.79	11.69	11.25	0.43	4.53	4.44	0.09	1.68	1.58	0.11
SIND	4.14	3.46	0.68	0.09	0	0.09	3.99	3.41	0.58	0	0	0	0.05	0.05	0
Urban	1.51	1.15	0.36	0.09	0	0.09	1.35	1.09	0.25	0	0	0	0.05	0.05	0
Rural	2.63	2.31	0.32	0	0	0	2.63	2.31	0.32	0	0	0	0	0	0
NWFP	21.54	19.04	2.50	4.58	4.36	0.22	9.53	8.96	0.56	7.06	5.35	1.71	0.36	0.36	0
Urban	2.36	1.92	0.43	0.63	0.59	0.04	0.35	0.35	0	1.28	0.89	0.38	0.08	0.08	0
Rural	19.18	17.11	2.07	3.94	3.76	0.17	9.18	8.61	0.56	5.78	4.46	1.32	0.27	0.26	0
BALUCHISTAN	0.85	0.85	0	0	0	0	0.49	0.49	0	0	0	0	0.35	0.34	0
Urban	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rural	0.85	0.85	0	0	0	0	0.49	0.49	0	0	0	0	0.35	0.34	0

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

Appendix Table: 5

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF IN-MIGRANTS (EXCLUDING FOR MARRIAGE) BY CURRENT AND PREVIOUS PLACE OF RESIDENCE (1972-79)

ALL AGES/BOTH SEXES

Previous Place of Residence	CURRENT PLACE OF RESIDENCE														
	PAKISTAN			PUNJAB			SIND			NWFP			BALUCHISTAN		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
PAKISTAN	100.00	35.49	64.51	73.87	24.25	49.62	16.98	8.30	8.67	8.59	2.71	5.87	0.56	0.22	0.34
Urban	27.79	16.51	11.28	18.36	10.88	7.47	5.55	3.79	1.77	3.34	1.65	1.70	0.54	0.19	0.34
Rural	72.21	18.98	53.23	55.51	13.36	42.14	11.43	4.53	6.90	5.25	1.06	4.19	0.02	0.02	0
PUNJAB	72.50	24.03	48.47	69.53	21.45	48.07	2.06	1.91	0.15	0.65	0.65	0	0.26	0.01	0.25
Urban	17.95	10.31	7.63	16.18	8.79	7.38	0.90	0.90	0	0.61	0.61	0	0.26	0.01	0.25
Rural	54.55	13.71	40.83	53.34	12.66	40.68	1.15	1.01	0.15	0.04	0.04	0	0	0	0
SIND	16.62	6.66	9.95	2.79	1.44	1.35	13.66	5.13	8.52	0.09	0.02	0.07	0.06	0.06	0
Urban	5.40	3.50	1.89	1.23	1.18	0.05	4.01	2.24	1.76	0.09	0.02	0.07	0.06	0.06	0
Rural	11.21	3.15	8.05	1.56	0.26	1.30	9.65	2.89	6.75	0	0	0	0	0	0
NWFP	10.18	4.23	5.95	1.54	1.35	0.19	0.81	0.81	0	7.80	2.04	5.76	0.03	0.03	0
Urban	3.77	2.12	1.65	0.94	0.91	0.04	0.19	0.19	0	2.63	1.02	1.61	0	0	0
Rural	6.41	2.10	4.31	0.59	0.44	0.15	0.62	0.62	0	5.16	1.02	4.15	0.03	0.03	0
BALUCHISTAN	0.69	0.56	0.13	0	0	0	0.44	0.44	0	0.03	0	0.03	0.02	0.12	0.09
Urban	0.65	0.56	0.09	0	0	0	0.44	0.44	0	0	0	0	0.02	0.12	0.09
Rural	0.03	0	0.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.03	0	0.03	0	0	0

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

Appendix Table: 6

DISTRIBUTION OF RETURN MIGRANT* BY PLACE OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION AND RURAL-URBAN (1972-79)

Previous Place of Residence	CURRENT PLACE OF RESIDENCE														
	PAKISTAN			PUNJAB			SIND			NWFP			BALUCHISTAN		
	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban
PAKISTAN	100.00	85.51	14.48	70.86	59.61	11.25	7.72	7.27	0.45	19.82	17.08	2.74	1 59	1.56	0.04
Rural	42.61	39.79	2.82	30.72	28.43	22.29	6.30	6.30	0	4.22	3.69	0.52	1.36	1.36	0
Urban	57.39	45.72	11.67	40.14	31.18	8.96	1.42	0.96	0.45	15.60	13.39	2.21	0.23	0.19	0.04
PUNJAB	63.92	53.29	10.63	58 06	47.83	10.24	0	0	0	5.87	5.46	0 40	0	0	0
Rural	29.06	26.80	2.38	28.04	25.74	2.30	0	0	0	1.03	0.94	0.09	0	0	0
Urban	34.86	26.60	8.26	30.03	22.09	7.94	0	0	0	4.83	4.52	0.31	0	0	0
SIND	23.19	21.95	1.24	9.67	9.07	0.60	7.60	7.27	0.33	4.55	4.25	0.30	1.36	1.36	0
Rural	11.07	11.07	0	2.30	2.30	0	6.30	6.30	0	1.09	1.09	0	1 36	1.36	0
Urban	12.12	10.88	1.24	7.37	6.76	0.60	1.29	0.96	0.33	3.45	3.15	0.30	0	0	0
NWFP	11.63	9.25	2.38	2.37	2.03	0.34	0	0	0	9.26	7.21	2.04	0	0	0
Rural	2.48	2.04	0.44	0.38	0.38	0	0	0	0	2.10	1.66	0.44	0	0	0
Urban	9.15	7.21	1.94	1.99	1.65	0.34	0	0	0	7.16	5.56	1.60	0	0	0
BALUCHISTAN	1.26	1.03	0.23	0.76	0.68	0.78	0.12	0	0.12	0.15	0.15	0	0.23	0.19	0.04
Rural	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Urban	1.26	1.03	0.23	0.76	0.68	0.78	0.12	0	0.12	0.15	0.15	0	0.23	0.19	0.04

*Return migrant from abroad are excluded from this Table to see the internal return frlow of migration only.

REFERENCES

1. Akram M. "Home Remittances" Business Records, February 2, 1978.

2. Ali Nazir "Manpower Export Impact on Pakistan's Economy" Economic Outlook, August 1978.

3. Bilsborrow, R. W. Surveys of Internal Migration in Low - Income Countries: Issues of Survey and Sample Design, ILO, Geneva, 1981

4. E.S.C.A.P. National Migration Surveys: Surveys Manuals. VI Sample Design Manual, U.N. New York, 1980

5. E.S.C.A.P. Internal Migration in the Countries of the ESCAP Region. Note by the ESCAP Secretariat for the Third Asian and Pacific Population Conference, 20-29 September 1982, Colombo.

6. Gilani Iiaz, M. Fahim Khan and M. Iqbal. Labour Migration From Pakistan to the Middle East and Its Impact upon the Domestic Economy, Part I, II and III, PIDE, Islamabad, 1981

7. I.M.F. Survey, Volume 7 No. 17, September 1978.

8. Government of Pakistan. Housing, Economic and Demographic Survey, Census Organization, Interior Division, Islamabad, 1974.

9. Government of Pakistan. Labour Force Survey 1974-75, Statistics Division, Karachi 1976.

10. Government of Pakistan. Labour Force Survey 1979-80, Federal Bureau of Statistics, Karachi, 1982

11. Government of Pakistan. Pakistan Economic Survey 1981-82, Islamabad, 1982

12. Government of Pakistan. The Fifth Five Year Plan 1978-83. The Planning Commission, Karachi, 1978.

13. ILO/ARTEP. Employment and Structural Change in Pakistan - Issues for the Eighties, ILO, Bangkok, 1983

14. Pervaiz Shahid (to be identified)

15. Ravenstein E. G. "The Laws of Migration", Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Vol. 48, 1886.

16. Sirageldin et. al.

17. Skeldon Ronald "Migration in South Asia: An Overview", in K. Maudood Elahi and L.Kosinski (eds) Populati[illegible]distribution in South Asia (forthcoming 1982).

18. Todaro M.P. Internal Migration in Developing Countries, ILO Geneva 1976.

19. Z. Zar. "External Migration of Labour From Pakistan" Overseas Employment Corporation Ltd. Government of Pakistan Karachi, 1978