

Migration & Labor Market History

Wilbald E. Maro

Introduction

Present labor markets within the villages and employment by village residents were examined in the previous chapter. This chapter examines the labor market activity of the non-resident members of the households, along with the labor market history of residents. We find high levels of outmigration for both communities, particularly for those in their twenties and thirties. However, the labor market history of residents and responses by relatives suggest that many of these present migrants are planning to return to the villages after working for some years elsewhere. The links between rural and urban areas are quite strong, with non-residents returning frequently for short visits, sending remittances, and in many cases returning permanently to the villages after retirement or loss of employment.

Migration decisions respond to both economic and social incentives, including income, education, family composition, age, and labor market conditions (Weinberg 1979). Migration in Ghana, for example, is responsive to income differentials and transportation costs (Beals, Levy, & Moses (1967). Social considerations may have both positive and negative impacts on migration decisions. As Mueller (1982) points out, "The availability of information and the non-pecuniary costs incurred by leaving one's social and work environs are certainly factors affecting migration decisions."

The first half of the chapter examines previous migration behavior for present residents, particularly looking at past incidents of salaried employment outside the village. The type of employment, location, periods of departure and return, and reasons for ending employment are investigated. We find that 44 percent of adult males aged 30 to 70 in Kenya have been employed elsewhere, living outside the village for some period of time, then returning. The percentage is

7.2 Maro

considerably smaller in Tanzania, at 16 percent. Locations other than cities were the destination for half the Kenyan migrants and more than half of the Tanzanian migrants. In contrast to the popular view and in accord with the findings of Bevan, Collier, & Gunning (1989), we find that jobs that required living away from home were frequently arranged *prior* to departing the village.

The second half examines the characteristics of non-resident family members, including age, education, family size, employment and income. All of these characteristics differ between migrants and non-migrants. Migration is considerably higher in Tanzania compared to Kenya, particularly among the 20 to 29 year age group.

Labor Market History: Location and Type of Work

In Tanzania a total of 33 jobs that either were salaried or required household members to live away from the village had been held by resident household members compared to 77 in Kenya (Table 7.1). We are particularly interested in the jobs that required household members to live away from home. In Tanzania, 17 persons held the 19 jobs of this type; in Kenya, 44 persons held the 59 jobs. Virtually all of these migrants are male: 16 out of 17 in Tanzania and 42 out of 44 in Kenya.¹ Most of these past migrants are now household heads: 11 in Tanzania and 34 in Kenya. Thus, about 10 percent of present household heads in Tanzania and 31 percent in Kenya are returned migrants.

These returned migrants also constitute a large proportion of the older adult male population; almost half (44%) of males in Kenya between 30 and 70 are returned migrants. The percentage at 16% is considerably smaller but still substantial in Tanzania.

The popular view of rural migration as modeled by Todaro views workers as permanently leaving rural areas, arriving in an urban area, and spending time looking for work. Our results challenge this view on two counts. First, cities are not the primary location for employment; only 18% of the Tanzanian jobs and a third of the Kenyan jobs were in cities. Of those who left home

¹ The one female migrant in Tanzania was the spouse of a migrating male; both worked in Mombasa for a time in the 1970's, and both are presently employed in the study community.

Table 7.1: Location and Arrangement of Past Employment

Location	Was Your Employment Already Arranged When You Left Home?											
	Tanzania						Kenya					
	Yes		No		Total		Yes		No		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Lived at Home	na	na	na	na	14	42.4	na	na	na	na	18	23.4
Another Village	2	10.5	-	-	2	6.1	6	10.2	3	5.1	9	11.7
Est/Large farm	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3.4	5	8.5	7	9.1
Small town	3	15.8	1	5.3	4	12.1	2	3.4	3	5.1	5	6.5
Large town	5	26.3	2	10.5	7	21.2	6	10.2	6	10.2	12	15.6
City	3	15.8	3	15.8	6	18.2	11	18.6	15	25.4	26	33.8
Total	13	68.4	6	31.6	33	100.0	27	45.8	32	54.2	77	100.0

Notes: The unit of observation in this table is jobs that were either salaried or required living away from home. Twenty-eight persons held the 33 jobs in Tanzania; 60 persons held the 77 jobs in Kenya. Interior percents are relative to the column totals.

for work, 35 percent of the Tanzanians and half of the Kenyans went to cities. Others left to take up residence in towns, other villages, or working on estates (in Kenya).

The second challenge to the popular view concerns whether or not the migrant leaves home in search of work, or leaves home in order to take up a job offer. Of the 19 jobs in Tanzania that required living elsewhere, thirteen (68%) were prearranged. The percentage is smaller in Kenya but still substantial at 46 percent. In many of these cases, a friend or relative had arranged the job prior to the respondent's move. Thus, social networks are important for finding employment, and the model of the unemployed male arriving in the city spending months looking for work is frequently inaccurate. Our findings are in accord with those of Bevan, Collier and Gunning (1989 p. 121), who state that for a majority of the migrants from Central Province "speculative migration was unnecessary because their social network had already secured them a job."

Table 7.2 breaks down the jobs by place of residence and type of employer. For type of employer, "urban" includes employers located in cities and towns, including Thika and Moshi. Thus, in Tanzania, 24 out of the 33 jobs (72.7%) involved working for urban employers; the

7.4 Maro

Table 7.2

corresponding figure in Kenya was 53.4%. None were employed by estates or farms in Tanzania, while several were so employed in Kenya. Overall, rural employers employed about 1/4 of the Tanzanians but more than forty percent of the Kenyans. As discussed in the previous chapter, the rural labor market is more active and diversified in the case of Kenya.

Of the Tanzanians who were employed while living at home, the majority were employed by urban employers (64.3%). These residents were commuting to Moshi, every day in some cases, in other cases spending three or four nights per week in town and coming home every weekend. The remainder of the Tanzanians were employed by rural government or parastatal institutions. No private rural employer was involved for any household member in our sample. It is different in Kenya where only 16.7% of those employed while living at home were employed by the urban institutions both public and private. Instead about a third (33.3%) were employed by the rural public and private institutions and about the same number (38.9%) were employed in farming activities in the rural areas. The nearest town to the Kenyan study site is some 35 kms away which makes it difficult to commute to and from the work place.

Labor Market History: Returning to the Village

Respondents returned to the village for both voluntary and involuntary reasons, as detailed in Table 7.3. Most returns -- 71% in Kenya and 68% in Tanzania -- were voluntary; the respondent quit working of his own accord. About 14% returned because of retirement in both places. A fair number -- almost a quarter -- quit in Kenya because of dissatisfaction with pay. Along with the pre-arrangement of employment examined above, this shows that these respondents were to a large extent in control of their lives rather than victims of circumstances beyond their control.

If these responses are broken down by age, we see no clear pattern in Tanzania; of those few returning migrants 35 and under, half returned for voluntary reasons and half for involuntary. Of those over 35, 75% returned for involuntary differences. These percentage differences may seem large, but the numbers are small, making the percentages not significantly different from each other. In Kenya, however, returning migrants under 35 came back primarily because of

Table 7.3: Reasons Returning Migrants Terminated Employment

Reasons	Tanzania		Kenya	
	#	%	#	%
TOTAL INVOLUNTARY	7	31.8	14	28.6
Empl. went out of business	1	4.5	6	12.2
Empl. cut back on employees	3	13.6	5	10.2
Job completed	3	13.6	1	2.0
Fired	-	-	2	4.1
TOTAL VOLUNTARY	15	68.2	35	71.4
Retired	3	13.6	7	14.3
Quit because not enough pay	2	9.1	12	24.5
Quit for other reasons	10	45.5	16	32.6
Total	22	100.0	49	100.0

involuntary termination (75%), while those over 35 came back primarily for voluntary reasons (85%).

Present Migration: Demographic Structure

We turn now to an examination of non-resident family members. Considering only those 20 and over, there were 388 migrants from Tanzania and 254 from Kenya. As shown in Table 7.4, although males are in the majority, there are a large number of female migrants also (43% in Tanzania, 47% in Kenya). Eighty percent of the migrants from each village are in the 20 to 39 age group.

Propensity to migrate -- measured here as the number of migrants in a certain age group divided by the sum of migrants and residents in that age group -- is astoundingly large. For Tanzanian males in their thirties, this propensity is 85%; that is, six out of every seven family members in this age range live elsewhere. Even for females in this age range the propensity to migrate is over 70%. Migration propensities peak for respondents in their thirties, falling to about 20% for those in their fifties.

This high propensity to migrate leads to high dependency ratios in the villages. We calculate these ratios as the percentage of the resident population aged 0-14 and over 65; for Tanzania the number is 47%, while it is 55% for Kenya.

Present Migration: Education

Education is positively associated with migration. This is usually attributed to being better-informed about economic opportunities elsewhere and being more willing and able to take advantage of them (Weinberg 1979). However, education does lead to some disincentives to migrate, as the better educated have more employment and income-earning opportunities at home also. So Beals, Levy, & Moses (1967) found migration to decrease with education in Ghana.

Here we find the usual positive relationship between education and migration in most cases, as shown in Table 7.4. Migrants have higher average education for all age groups in Tanzania, with migrants aged 20 to 59 on average having 2.5 more years of schooling compared to their non-migrant age-mates. In Kenya the story is similar for the population aged 30 and over, but migrants in their twenties have marginally less education than non-migrants. This is indicative of a change in the labor market, which casual observation would suggest has intensified since the time of our survey; this result is consistent with structural adjustment policies beginning to increase opportunities in rural areas relative to urban areas (even if overall job opportunities were not increasing or were even decreasing at this time). Many of our Kenyan respondents made comments to the effect that educated sons or daughters were giving up searching for work in the cities.

Present Migration: Location & Main Occupation

As shown in Table 7.5, most of the migrants -- over 80% in Tanzania and 55% in Kenya -- moved to towns or cities. A considerable number within Tanzania and quite a large number in Kenya moved to other villages. A number of these were women moving to the villages of their husbands, but in Kenya males moving to work in other rural areas were also important.

Table 7.6 breaks down employment by sex and employer. Farming is listed as the employment of 35% of the Kenyan migrants and 20% of the Tanzania migrants. Note that "farming" is usually listed as the occupation of migrant married women living in other villages,

7.8 Maro

Table 7.4 Mean Education of Migrants vs Residents by Age

Age	Tanzania		Kenya	
	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents
20-29	9.5	7.4	8.7	8.9
30-39	8.7	7.5	8.4	6.7
40-49	8.4	5.3	6.5	3.4
50-59	6.9	4.4	3.9	3.1
Total	8.9	6.4	8.1	6.4

Table 7.5: Location of Migrants from Tanzania and Kenya.

Location	Tanzania		Kenya	
	Count	%	Count	%
Unknown	1	0.2	0	0.0
Another Village	79	18.7	115	44.7
Agr. Estate/Large Farm	1	0.2	1	0.4
Small Town	63	14.9	29	11.3
Large Town	135	32.0	37	14.4
City	143	33.9	75	29.2
Total	422	100.0	257	100.0

explaining the large preponderance of women in this category. About 42% of the Tanzania migrants were employed in urban areas; the corresponding number for Kenya was 22%. In each country, the ratio of men to women employed in urban jobs was about two to one, in accordance with our expectations. Rural government and private employers constitute less than 10% of employment for migrants from both villages. About 18% of the Tanzanians and 24% of the Kenyans were unemployed at the time of our survey. Thus, most who left the village were engaged in productive work of some kind.

Table 7.7 lists main occupation by the level of education. There is a clear relationship between education and urban employment with migrants from both locations. In Tanzania, about 34% of the migrants with some primary education were employed in urban areas; this percentage increases to 52%, 67%, and 92% for migrants with some secondary, upper secondary, and university education. For Kenya, the percentages are uniformly lower, but move in the same

Table 7.6: Main Occupation of Migrants from Tanzania and Kenya by Sex.

Country	Main Occupation	Sex					
		Male		Female		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Tanzania	Farming	18	4.3	61	14.5	79	18.7
	Labor on other peoples shamba	9	2.1	1	0.2	10	2.4
	Labor on est/large farm	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Empl. by rural priv. employer	2	0.5	1	0.2	3	0.7
	Empl. by rural govt/parast. employer	9	2.1	9	2.1	18	4.3
	Empl. by urban priv. employer	39	9.2	12	2.8	51	12.1
	Empl. by urban govt/parast. employer	78	18.5	50	11.8	128	30.3
	Trading and Farming	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.2
	Trading	47	11.1	10	2.4	57	13.5
	Unemployed/didn't find work	34	8.1	41	9.7	75	17.8
	Total	237	56.2	185	43.8	422	100.0
Kenya	Farming	24	9.0	56	20.9	80	29.9
	Labor on other peoples shamba	7	2.6	0	0.0	7	2.6
	Labor on est/large farm	5	1.9	1	0.4	6	2.2
	Empl. by rural priv. employer	6	2.2	2	0.7	8	3.0
	Empl. by rural govt/parast. employer	10	3.7	5	1.9	15	5.6
	Empl. by urban priv. employer	26	9.7	11	4.1	37	13.8
	Empl. by urban govt/parast. employer	15	5.6	8	3.0	23	8.6
	Trading and Farming	6	2.2	0	0.0	6	2.2
	Trading	14	5.2	8	3.0	22	8.2
	Unemployed/didn't find work	26	9.7	38	14.2	64	23.9
	Total	139	51.9	129	48.1	268	100.0

direction: 18%, 29%, 50%, and 50%, moving from some primary to university education. The percentage who work in trading and farming falls dramatically with education.

7.10 *Maro*

Table 7.7

Present Migration: Reason for Departure and Expectation of Return

Table 7.8 details the reasons for the migrant's departure from the village. Job seeking and job offers were the major reasons in both communities. In Tanzania these accounted for half of all migrants, while in Kenya they accounted for 40%. Over 80% of those seeking work and taking up job offers were male. Forty-one percent of the males in Tanzania moved to take up a job offer, while the percentage in Kenya was 24%. Considering in Kenya only those for whom the reason for moving was known, we find that 33% of the Kenyan male migrants moved to take up a job offer. This is smaller than the figure given by Bevan, Collier, and Gunning (1989), who found that half of the male migrants from Central Province in the early eighties moved to take up a prior job offer.

Marriage was the reason for 54% of the female migrants from Tanzania and 65% of the female migrants from Kenya.

We asked the respondents whether or not they expected the migrants to return, and if so, when. Leaving out those women who left for marriage (who were almost exclusively not expected to return), 34% of the migrants from Tanzania and 45% of those from Kenya were not expected to return. This leaves a large proportion expected to come back to the village at some future date. In Tanzania, a substantial proportion of these -- 24% of all migrants other than those who left for marriage -- are expected to return when they inherit land. This category was completely unimportant in Kenya. Almost exactly 1/4 of the non-marriage migrants were expected to return after retiring.

Present Migration: Remittances

We attempted to solicit information on incomes of present migrants, but understandably our resident respondents usually did not know the incomes of their non-resident family members. For those with reports of income (8 migrants from Tanzania and 27 from Kenya), mean incomes are four times as high for the Kenyan migrants.

7.12 *Maro*

Table 7.8

Table 7.9: Mean Amount Remitted per Month by Age Group.

Age group (Years)	Money Sent in by Migrants in Kshs Equivalent					
	Tanzania			Kenya		
	Mean	Count	%	Mean	Count	%
15 to 19	60	3	2.2	133	3	6.1
20 to 29	48	41	30.6	316	22	44.9
30 to 39	45	60	44.8	300	13	26.5
40 to 49	57	22	16.4	239	10	20.4
50 to 59	39	3	2.2	200	1	2.0
60 to 69	133	5	3.7	0	0	0.0
Total	52	134	100.0	282	49	100.0

Data on remittances are much better. One reason for moving out would be to seek alternate employment so that one can take care of the other members of the family left behind. These data are reported in Table 7.9. Forty-nine of the Kenyan migrants were reported to have sent remittances home during the two months prior to our second round survey. This constitutes 18% of all migrants, and 26% of migrants excluding women who left the village because of marriage. Of the Tanzania migrants, 134 had sent remittances home, 32% of all migrants, and 42% of migrants other than those who left for marriage.

The mean amounts remitted by the Kenyan households are quite large (note that in calculating the means we are averaging only over those with positive remittances). Three hundred Kenya shillings at this time was about US\$ 10, and about 12 days of pay for a casual laborer in Kenya. Amounts remitted by the Tanzanian migrants are much less, averaging less than 1/5 of the Kenyan remittances. This is at least consistent with the few migrants for whom we have reported incomes. For these few cases, the correlation between migrant reported income and migrant remittances is 0.79 in Tanzania and 0.65 in Kenya.

Only one migrant in Tanzania is remitting more than Ksh 180 per month; this is less than the Kenyan mean, and less than 22 of the Kenyan migrants. Eighteen percent of the Kenyans sending remittances sent more than Ksh 450 per month home.

Conclusions

This chapter has described the history of migration of rural residents, and migration patterns of non-resident family members. Many of the present heads of household have spent time working in other parts of the country, mainly in urban areas, returning home usually after voluntarily leaving their position of employment. They left home originally to a large extent because of employment opportunities already arranged for them. Such behavior is indicative of strong links between rural and urban areas.

There are a very large number of present migrants, with the propensity to migrate over 70% for Kenyan males in their thirties, and over 85% for Tanzanian males in that age group. These migrants are more highly educated than their peers who remain in the village, except the most recent age cohort in Kenya, for which there is only a small difference in education. This may be indicative of a change in migration patterns, following the beginning of structural adjustment policies that should turn rural/urban terms of trade in favor of rural areas.

Present residents expect the majority of the migrants to return to the village, either after inheriting land or retiring. Perhaps for this reason, many migrants continue to have strong links to their home village, remitting very substantial amounts of money to their households. This is especially so in the Kenyan village.

In sum, the evidence presented here strengthens the arguments advanced by Collier and Lal (1986) and Bevan, Collier, & Gunning (1989) that rural households should not be considered as isolated from the overall economy, and that migrants should not be considered as permanent immigrants into urban areas. Instead, these rural communities are closely linked with urban and other rural areas through labor movements, with remittances returning to the village, and with migrants expected for the most part to return after working for a period of time elsewhere.

References

- Beals, R.F., M.B. Levy, & N. Moses. 1967. "Rationality and Migration in Ghana." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 49: 480-486.
- Bevan, David, Paul Collier, and J.W. Gunning. 1989. *Peasants and Governments*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Collier, Paul, and Deepak Lal. 1986. *Labor and Poverty in Kenya: 1900-1980*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Mueller, C.F. 1982. *The Economics of Labor Migration: A Behavioral Analysis*. New York: Academic Press.
- Weinberg, D.H. 1979. "The Determinants of Inter-Urban Household Mobility." *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 9: 219-246.