SIZE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY MIGRANTS IN EGYPT BEFORE AND AFTER THE MIGRATION PROCESS

DR. FAWZI GOMAH TORKI*

I. Introduction:

Internal migration is one of the basic components of population growth of certain areas within a country. It affects population redistribution and hence the socio-economic and demographic composition of the population in particular areas and the extent to which they experience certain social and economic problems.

Therefore, it is true as Claeson and Egero (1973, p. 56) stated that "Knowledge about the movement of the population is fundamental for the understanding of social change, economic development and political organization. It is an important element in the history of a nation and an essential component in the planning for its future".

It is well known also and documented in the literature that migrants are a selective group of persons and not a random sample from the total population of a country with respect to certain characteristics such as age, sex, education, marital status, etc. (See for example, Shaw, 1975; Simmons et al 1977; Adepoju, 1979).

Such selectivity may or may not put the migrants in a better competitive position than the non-migrants in the urban labour market or than themselves at the place of origin, i.e., before migration. So, it seems of vital importance to study the characteristics of migrants as contrasted with those of non-migrants and/or the general population.

---

* Central Agency for public Mobilization and Statistics, Cairo, Egypt.

Hence, this paper attempts to examine the size and characteristics of primary migrants in Egypt. It discusses these characteristics (social, economic and demographic) both before and after the migration process and according to basic streams of migration, i.e., urban to urban; rural to urban; urban to rural and rural to rural, using the most recent available data in this respect.

II. DATA USED IN THE STUDY:

The primary source of data to be used in this study is the Internal Migration Differentiation Sample Survey in Egypt (in brief EMS) conducted by the Central Agency for Public Mobilisation and Statistics (CAPMAS) for the first time in 1979. This survey is based on a large sample which covered all governorates of Egypt except Red Sea, Matrouh and Sinia. It aims at providing detailed and accurate information on the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the migrants before and after the migration process (at origin and destination); factors affecting the decision to migrate, and the environmental conditions surrounding the migrants at their places of origin (CAPMAS, 1979; UN, 1982).

The sample size was about 58,000 households which has been distributed proportionately between urban and rural areas using the number of households in each of them as reported in the 1976 census. It covered about 27,000 house-

holds in urban areas and 31,000 in rural areas. A single stage systematic sample was adopted in rural areas and thus, 30 villages were selected. As for urban areas, it was decided to stratify them into two strata and thus, 95 enumeration areas were selected systematically in the Capitals of governorates, constituting the first stratum and, 32 enumeration areas were also selected systematically in the Capitals of Markazes, constituting the second stratum (CAPMAS, 1979, p. 2).

Therefore, the sample is statistically representative for both migrants to urban areas and to rural areas but not so at the governorate level. This is why our analysis in the present study is carried out at both rural and urban levels of Egypt and not at the level of the governorate.

A complete enumeration of the surveyed households covered by this sample was carried out at the mid-night of December 31, 1978 - January 1, 1979 to obtain a complete framework about the migrants in these households. Those migrants were surveyed and data were collected during the period from April 17 to May 6, 1979 (CAPMAS, 1979, p. 1).

To make full use of data collected in the 1979 survey about the topic of this study, special migration tables have been planned and produced by the researcher through the National Computing Center of CAPMAS and through the Population Studies Center of University of Pennsylvania.

The basic limitation of the 1979 survey, however, is that

no data are yet available about the total population from which migrants were derived. Such data if available, would help in studying the non-migrants and hence, in making a comparison between them and the migrants with respect to the topic of this study. Fortunately, such comparison can be attempted using data from the 1976 census since the period elapsed between the census date (1976) and the survey date (1979) was only about 2.5 years which seems insufficient to effect any major change in the characteristics of the population, especially under normal conditions.

It is necessary here to define the primary migrant since this study is confined to primary migrants only. By a primary migrant is meant any person, aged 15 years and over at the time of the survey (1979), who made the decision to migrate from one area (city or village) to another for any reason other than to accompany his or her family as a dependent. The difference between the place of last usual residence and the place of current usual residence is used in this survey to distinguish the migrants from the non-migrants.

Moreover, by migration stream is meant the body of migrants having a common area of origin (departure) and a common area of destination (arrival).

The following sections will discuss the size of primary migrants streams and their demographic, social and economic characteristics before and after the migration process.

III. PRIMARY MIGRANTS STREAMS:

The results of the 1979 survey have shown that out of about 22,000 primary migrants, 66% have migrated to urban areas of Egypt and the remaining 34% to rural areas, as can be seen from Table (1). Of those migrating to urban areas slightly more than one half originated from rural areas (rural to urban migration) and the rest from urban areas (urban to urban stream). Of those migrating to rural areas slightly less than one fifth had originated from urban areas (urban to rural) and the remainder from rural areas (rural to rural).

On the whole, rural to urban and urban to urban migration streams represented the major streams in 1979 (about one third each of the total primary migrants) followed by rural to rural (slightly more than one quarter), then urban to rural (about 7%).

Interestingly, more than four-fifths of primary male migrants have migrated to urban areas whereas more than half of primary female migrants have migrated to rural areas. As revealed elsewhere, the basic reason for migration among males is economic one (to take up or seek a job) whereas marriage related reasons are the basic factor affecting migration among females (see, CAPMAS, 1979). So, it is to be expected that male migrants to urban areas will be more pronounced than females since the opportunities for work there are relatively

Table (1) - Primary Migrants by Sex, In-Migration Rates and Sex Ratios According to Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1979

Basic Migration Streams	Males		Females		Total		Sex Ratio	In-Mig. Rates*
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
urban to urban	4929	44.9	2228	20.4	7157	32.7	221	5.6
rural to urban	4570	41.6	2695	24.7	7265	33.2	170	5.7
To urban areas	9499	86.4	4923	45.1	14422	65.8	193	11.3
urban to rural	440	4.0	1149	10.5	1589	7.3	33	0.9
rural to rural	1051	9.6	4845	44.4	5896	26.9	22	3.4
To rural areas	1491	13.6	5994	54.9	7485	34.2	25	4.3
Total	10990	100.0	10917	100.0	21907	100.0	101	7.3

Source: Special Migration Tables, EMS, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1979.

(*) In-migration rates are per 100 surveyed population at destination, i.e., urban population in case of rural to urban and urban to urban primary migrants and rural population in case of urban to rural and rural to rural ones.

higher than in rural areas. This point will be further discussed later on.

In addition, Table (1) also shows that about 11% of urban population (suveyed in 1979) are involved in either urban to urban or rural to urban migration streams (about 6% each). On the other hand, about 4% of rural population are involved in either urban to rural stream (about one per cent) or rural to rural (about 3%).

The results of the 1976 census also show that the great bulk of migrants have migrated to urban areas (about four-fifths of all migrants) and that male migrants are more representative than females in these areas whereas the reverse is true with respect to rural areas, as can be seen from Table (2).

Table (2) - Migrants by Sex, In-Migration Rates and Sex Ratios According to Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1976 (000')

Basic Migration Streams	Males		Females		Total		Sex Ratio	In-Mig. Rates*
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
urban to urban	1447	56.9	1352	53.5	2799	55.2	107	17.5
rural to urban	708	27.8	610	24.2	1318	26.0	116	6.4
To urban areas	2155	84.7	1962	77.7	4117	81.2	110	11.3
urban to rural	163	6.4	182	7.2	345	6.8	90	2.2
rural to rural	226	8.8	382	15.1	608	12.0	59	3.0
To rural area	389	15.3	564	22.3	953	18.8	69	2.6
Total	2544	100.0	2526	100.0	5070	100.0	101	13.9

(*) Migration Rates are per 100 population at risk of migration, i.e., rural population in case of rural to urban and rural to rural migration streams and urban population in case of urban to urban and urban to rural ones.

Source: Computed from the 1976 census, Vol. 2, The Total Republic, Table 14, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1978.

Table (3) - Percentage Distribution of Primary Migrants By Sex, Duration of Current Residence, and Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1979

Duration of Current Residence	urban to urban	rural to urban	urban to rural	rural to rural	Total
	MALES				
< 5 years	17.3	14.4	29.3	14.2	16.3
5 -	22.7	18.8	16.6	12.9	19.9
10 -	16.3	15.2	17.0	19.4	16.2
15 -	14.7	14.3	10.7	23.5	15.2
20 +	29.0	37.3	26.4	29.9	32.4
Total (100%)	4929	4570	440	1051	10990
	FEMALES				
< 5 years	20.9	20.4	24.5	19.0	20.3
5 -	22.9	20.3	17.8	15.3	18.3
10 -	10.9	15.4	12.1	11.6	13.3
15 -	13.0	11.5	10.4	15.0	13.2
20 +	27.9	32.4	35.1	39.2	34.8
Total (100%)	2228	2695	1149	4845	10917

Source: Computed from Special Migration Tables, EMS, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1979.

A great caution, however, should be considered when comparing the results of the 1976 census (Table 2) with the results of the 1979 survey (Table 1), since the former referred to all migrants whereas the latter are confined to primary migrants only as defined earlier.

To what extent are primary migrants in 1979 considered as recent or settled migrants? By recent migrant is meant those people who migrated within the previous 10 years whereas settled migrants are those persons who migrated 10 or more years ago. Table (3) shows the percentage distribution of primary migrants by sex, duration of current residence and basic migration streams. It is clear from the table that slightly more than one third of all primary male migrants and about two fifths of all primary female migrants in 1979 are qualified as recent migrants. Urban to urban primary male and female migrants have recorded the highest proportion of recent migrants among them (about two fifths or more) compared with other migration streams. On the other hand, rural to rural primary male or female migrants have recorded the lowest proportion of recent migrants (about one quarter in case of males and one third in case of females).

Interestingly, the results of the 1976 census have shown that about one half of either male of female migrants were considered as recent migrants in this year. However, recent migrants in rural areas were slightly higher in 1976 than those in urban areas, as can be seen from Table (4). Again, the deviations in this respect between 1976 census results and 1979 survey results are attributed to the same reason mentioned earlier.

The extent of migration recency may have some impact on the achievement of migrants especially for those migrating to

Table (4) - Percentage Distribution of Migrants By Sex and Duration of Current Residence in Rural and Urban Areas, Egypt, 1976

Current Duration		Males	Females	Total
		URBAN AREAS		
< 5		33.4	33.7	33.5
5 -		15.9	17.3	16.6
10 +		50.7	49.0	49.9
Total	%	100.0	100.0	100.0
	No.	2177875	1979628	4157503
		RURAL AREAS		
< 5		34.9	29.0	31.4
5 -		21.3	18.8	19.8
10 +		43.8	52.2	48.8
Total	%	100.0	100.0	100.0
	No.	393206	568346	961552

Source: Computed from the 1976 census, vol. 2, Table 17 (The Total Republic), CAPMAS, Cairo, 1978.

urban areas. It was noticed that the longer the duration of residence in the city the higher is the socio-economic status of migrants since the knowledge about urban labour market; training and skills increase with the increase in duration of residence (See, Zachariah, 1968; Standing, 1978; Sabot, 1982). This point, however, will be treated in more detail in another study.

IV. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY MIGRANTS:

The available demographic characteristics of primary migrants from the 1979 survey are age, sex and marital status both before and after the migration process. These characteristics are discussed below subsequently.

A. Age and Sex:

To what extent are primary migrants selective with respect to age and sex and thus, are not a random sample of the total population in Egypt? The results of the 1979 survey clearly show that migrants to urban areas are highly male selective whereas migrants to rural areas are highly female selective. But, for Egypt as a whole migration is balanced by both sexes. The sex ratio of primary migrants to urban areas was 193 males per 100 females whereas that of primary migrants to rural areas was only 25 males per 100 females. For the whole country, the sex ratio was 101 males per 100 females in 1979 (See Table (1)).

The highest sex ratio has been recorded for urban to urban migrants (221) and the lowest one for rural to rural migrants (22). The reason for such very high sex ratio in case of migration to urban areas may be an economic one (to seek or take up job and/or changing the place of work) especially in case of males; whereas the reason for such low sex ratio in case of migration to rural areas may be a social one (marriage) especially in case of females.

Table (5) - Percentage Distribution of Primary Migrants by Sex, Age at Migration, Current Age and Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1979

Basic Streams		Age at Migration				Current Age				Numbe
		15- (1)	30-	45+	Total	15-	30-	45+	Total	
urban to	M	53.1	35.1	11.8	100.0	11.2	39.0	49.8	100.0	492
urban	F	87.0	8.7	4.3	100.0	32.5	42.1	25.4	100.0	222
rural to	M	71.1	23.0	5.9	100.0	14.9	40.6	44.5	100.0	457
urban	F	91.5	5.5	3.0	100.0	36.4	37.3	26.3	100.0	269
urban to	M	48.6	37.7	13.6	100.0	12.3	33.3	54.4	100.0	44
rural	F	93.8	5.0	1.2	100.0	36.3	34.6	29.2	100.0	114
rural to	M	50.0	33.4	16.6	100.0	8.8	29.7	61.5	100.0	105
rural	F	92.9	5.0	2.1	100.0	31.4	35.6	33.0	100.0	484
Total	M	60.1	30.0	9.9	100.0	12.6	38.6	48.8	100.0	1099
	F	91.4	5.9	2.7	100.0	33.4	37.3	29.3	100.0	1091

(1) About 2% (214) of the male and 4% (476) of the female primary migrants were below age 15 at time of migration. These persons are included with the 15-29 age group here.

Source: Computed from Special Migration Tables, EMS, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1979.

The results of the 1976 census also confirms male selectivity among migrants to urban areas and female selectivity among migrants to rural areas, despite the fact that the magnitude of sex ratios in 1976 was much lower than that in 1979

(See Table (2)). The comparison between the two sources of data in this respect, however, is not valid for reasons mentioned earlier.

As regards the age composition of primary migrants at the time of their migration, it is noticed that three fifths of primary male migrants and nine tenths of primary female migrants in 1979 were aged less than 30 years at the time of their migration, as can be seen from Table (5). Also, about seven tenths of rural to urban males and slightly more than half of urban to urban ones were in this age group (15-29 years) at the time of their migration.

If the age group 30-44 years is added to that of 15-29 years then, the great majority of primary migrants, both males and females, in each migration stream were less than 45 years at the time of their migration. In addition, it is clear from Table (5) that primary female migrants involved in each migration stream were younger at the time of their migration than male migrants.

Furthermore, rural to urban male migrants seem to be younger than urban to urban ones and rural to rural males migrants, in turn, seem to be younger than urban to rural at the time of their migration.

The preceding analysis is completely consistent with what is known and documented in the literature about the predominance of youth and young adults among the migrants (See, CDC, 1973; Shaw, 1975; Adepoju, 1979).

Table (6) - Percentage Distribution of Migrants Aged 15 years and over at the time of Migration By Sex, Age and Rural-Urban Residence, Egypt, 1976

Current Residence	Sex	Age at Migration			
		15-	30-	45+	Total (100%)
urban areas	M	63.7	26.5	9.8	1360599
	F	72.1	18.7	9.2	1239681
	T	67.7	22.8	9.5	2600280
rural areas	M	52.0	33.5	14.5	205025
	F	77.2	16.0	6.8	360953
	T	68.1	22.4	9.6	565978
Total	M	62.1	27.4	10.5	1565624
	F	73.2	18.1	8.7	1600634
	T	67.8	22.7	9.5	3166258

Source: Computed from the 1976 census, vol. 2, The Total Republic, Table 17, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1978.

This phenomenon can be further supported by the results of the 1976 census where the majority of migrants aged 15 years and over in this year, both males and females, were young adults and youth in the working age groups, as can be seen from Table (6). For them, the median age at migration was about 27 years for males and 25 years for females.

Being young adults and youth to a great extent, migrants are thus expected to be more economically active than the total

population and/or the non-migrants (See, Zachariah, 1968; Brigg, 1973; Standing, 1978). This point, however, will be treated in more detail in another study.

It should be remembered here that the proportion of primary male or female migrants in the age group 65 years and over was almost negligible at the time of their migration (less than one per cent each). Such proportion with respect to current age was about 10% in case of male migrants and 5% in case of females.

B. Marital Status:

The marital status of migrants is not available in any population census. Fortunately, it is available in the 1979 survey for the primary migrants whether at origin or destination (before and after migration). Table (7) presents it by sex and basic migration streams. It should be remembered that, by destination it is meant in this study the current situation as reported in 1979. The figures in Table (7) clearly show that the proportion of singles among migrants in each migration stream was considerably higher at origin than at destination (in 1979). This is true for both males and females. Also, the proportion of single among female migrants was somewhat higher (44%) than that among males (39%) before migration. The reverse, however, is true after migration.

Interestingly, about one half of either urban to rural

Table (7) - Percentage Distribution of Primary Migrants by Sex, Marital Status at Origin and Destination and Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1979

Basic Streams	At origin				At destination			
	S	M	D+W	T (100%)	S	M	D+W	T (100%
	MALES							
urban to urban	38.9	55.1	1.6	4929	4.5	92.9	2.3	4929
rural to urban	41.1	48.8	1.3	4570	5.5	92.2	2.2	4570
urban to rural	37.3	54.5	6.4	440	5.9	91.1	3.0	440
rural to rural	26.3	65.8	4.0	1051	2.4	94.3	3.3	1051
Total (1)	38.5	53.5	1.9	100.0	4.8	92.7	2.4	100.0
	4232	5876	210	10990	533	10184	262	10990
	FEMALES							
urban to urban	44.6	41.8	10.5	2228	1.6	82.4	15.8	2228
rural to urban	38.0	48.5	8.9	2695	1.7	84.3	13.5	2695
urban to rural	48.5	40.3	9.1	1149	1.6	83.6	14.6	1149
rural to rural	45.9	42.6	8.9	4845	0.2	82.4	17.3	4845
Total (1)	44.0	43.7	9.2	100.0	1.0	83.0	15.8	100.0
	4800	4767	1009	10917	110	9062	1724	10917

(1) Differences from the respective absolute and relative totals are due to the exclusion of those below the age of marriage (16 years for females and 18 years for males).

Source: Computed from Special Migration Tables, EMS, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1979.

or rural to rural female migrants were singles at the time of migration. But, after migration only 2% among the former and only 0.2% among the latter were so classified. This suggests that the main reason for female migration to rural areas is marriage. To a smaller extent, this also applies to female migrants involved in rural to urban and urban to urban migrant streams (See Table 7).

Apart from this, no significant differences existed between one basic migration stream and another with respect to marital status either before or after migration. This means that the impact of migration on the marital status of primary migrants seems to be small especially in the case of males.

However, it is to be expected that the marital status of female migrants will affect their activity rates (their participation rates in the labour force) both before and after the migration process. It is well known and documented in the literature that single females are more likely to be more economically active than married females. Also, the latter are less active than divorced and widowed females (See for example, CDC, 1973; Nassif, 1974; Standing, 1978). This point, however, is out the scope of this study and will be treated in another study.

V. SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY MIGRANTS:

The only available social characteristics to be discussed here from the results of the 1979 survey is education. It has been observed that migrants are better educated than non-migrants and that at least, migrants are in an intermediate educational position as compared with the population at origin and the population at destination (See for example, Lee, 1966; Kosniski and Prothero, 1974; Connell et al, 1975; Simmons et al, 1977).

This strongly holds true in case of primary migrants in Egypt in 1979, both males and females. The index of migration differentials defined as the difference between the proportion of migrants and the proportion of non-migrants (or the total population) divided by that of non-migrants (or the total population) and multipled by 100 with respect to any specific characteristic (UN, 1970, p. 45), is used here to examine such conclusion. It is clear from Table (8) that primary migrants in 1979, both males and females were at least in an intermediate educational position as compared with rural population and urban population in 1976. No doubt they are better educated than urban populatin starting from intermediate level of education and over.

It should be mentioned here that the positive values in Table (8) indicate that migrants are more represented in certain educational status than the total population whereas, the

Table (8) - Index of Migration Differentials (*) Between Primary Migrants in 1979 and Non-migrants in 1976 According to Educational Status and Rural-Urban Residence and Sex, Egypt, 1976 and 1979

Educational status	Urban		Rural		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Illiterate	+ 41	+ 63	- 32	- 6	- 15	+ 12
Read and write	- 9	- 56	+ 8	+ 17	+ 1	- 28
Primary	- 66	- 80	- 36	- 4	- 52	- 60
Preparatory	- 63	- 79	- 21	+ 67	- 44	- 54
Intermediate	+ 23	- 40	+ 261	+ 700	+111	+ 41
University and over	+135	- 17	+1250	+1400	+391	+114

(*) Index of Migration differentials is the difference between the proportion of migrants and the proportion of non-migrants in certain educational status divided by the proportion of non-migrants in this educational status multiplied by 100 (See UN, 1970, p. 45).

Source: Computed from the 1976 census, vol. 2 and from Special Migration Tables, EMS, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1978 and 1979.

negative values indicate the reverse situation.

Interestingly, the results of the 1976 census about migrants and non-migrants and/or the total population in this year strongly supported the preceding conclusion (See 1976 census, vols. 1 and 2, Tables 5 and 19).

Comparing now the educational status of primary migrants at origin with that at destination (in 1979), it is clear from Table (9) that little improvement has been achieved among

Table (9) - Percentage Distribution of Primary Migrants by Sex, Educational Status at Origin and Destination and Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1979

Educational Status	u → u		r → u		u → r		r → r		Total	
	O	D	O	D	O	D	O	D	O	D
	MALES									
Illiterate	29.6	28.6	41.7	39.8	51.4	50.0	69.7	67.1	39.3	37.8
Read & write	25.2	26.1	29.0	30.9	29.8	31.1	22.5	25.1	26.7	28.2
Primary	6.0	5.7	5.1	4.9	3.2	3.0	2.3	2.2	5.1	4.9
Preparatory	3.6	3.3	5.0	4.6	2.5	2.5	0.5	0.5	3.9	3.5
Intermediate	20.3	19.5	13.2	12.8	8.4	8.6	3.9	4.0	15.3	14.8
Univ. & over	15.3	16.8	6.1	7.1	4.8	4.8	1.1	1.1	9.7	10.8
Total (100%)	4929		4570		440		1051		10990	
	FEMALES									
Illiterate	53.9	53.5	81.5	81.0	81.5	80.6	94.4	94.1	81.6	81.2
Read & write	15.4	15.8	10.1	10.7	10.8	11.7	3.7	4.0	8.4	8.9
Primary	5.3	5.2	2.4	2.3	2.1	2.2	0.7	0.7	2.2	2.2
Preparatory	5.1	4.5	1.2	1.0	1.3	1.3	0.4	0.4	1.7	1.5
Intermediate	14.4	14.6	4.3	4.3	3.9	3.8	0.8	0.8	4.8	4.8
Univ. & over	5.8	6.3	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.4	-	-	1.4	1.5
Total (100%)	2228		2695		1149		4845		10917	

u = urban, r = rural, o = origin and d = destination

Source: Computed from Special Migration Tables, EMS, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1979.

migrants to urban areas, both males and females, regardless of their origin. A slight decrease in the proportion illiterates among them has been occurred in 1979 as compared with that at origin whereas the proportions of those having university level of education and over and of those reading and writing migrants have slightly increased. This may suggest that migrants had completed their education before their last move.

As noted earlier, the basic factor affecting the decision to migrate among males especially those migrating to urban areas seems to be economic related reasons and as such, those migrating for educational reasons seem to be relatively much smaller in their size.

On the other hand, migration to rural areas seems to have not accompanied by any noticeable improvements in the educational status of migrants involved especially in case of females whose basic factor for migration is marriage related reasons, as noted earlier.

However, it seems more important to examine the educational status of active migrants before and after the migration process to see the impact of migration on their educational attainment and on their occupational promotion after migration as compared with that before it. Nevertheless, this point is out of the scope of this study and will be treated in more detail in another study.

VI. ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY MIGRANTS:

This section deals with three characteristics of primary migrants, i.e., industry; employment status and occupational status, both before and after the migration process as revealed by the results of the 1979 survey. It is to be noted here that employment status of migrants is not available from any census in Egypt and is made available for the first time by this survey. These economic characteristics are discussed separately below.

A. Industrial Structure:

The results of the 1979 survey clearly show that primary migrants on the whole have undergone basic changes in their industrial structure at destination as compared with that at origin. These changes are more pronounced among migrants to urban areas than among migrants to rural areas and among males than among females, as can be seen from Table (10). For example, 18% of urban to urban male migrants were engaged in agricultural sector before migration but, after migration only 3% were so classified in 1979. A decrease of 15 percentage points as a result of migration.

The corresponding proportions in case of rural to urban male migrants were 57% at origin and only 3% at destination, a decrease of 54 percentage points. As regards male migrants

Table (10) - Percentage Distribution of Employed Primary Migrants by Sex, Industry at Origin and Destination and Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1979

Industry	u → u		r → u		u → r		r → r	
	O	D	O	D	O	D	O	D
	MALES							
Agriculture and Related	18.1	3.4	57.4	3.3	36.8	41.1	75.9	68.8
Mining and Quarrying	0.4	0.8	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.5	--	0.1
Manufacturing	19.4	23.4	9.7	26.2	13.3	11.7	5.1	6.5
Electric., Gas and Water	2.6	3.0	0.8	1.5	0.7	1.0	0.1	0.1
Building and Construction	6.2	8.9	4.3	10.4	7.6	2.2	1.8	2.1
Commerce, Hotels	11.5	13.0	7.6	15.6	7.8	7.5	2.3	3.1
Trans. and Commun.	8.4	10.1	4.6	9.0	7.8	7.0	2.2	2.2
Insurance and Bus. Services	1.5	1.8	0.5	1.5	1.2	1.0	0.2	0.2
Services	30.5	34.6	13.7	31.1	21.9	26.7	10.7	15.7
Not Adeq. Described	1.4	1.0	1.2	0.7	2.7	1.0	1.7	1.2
Total (100%)	4249	4331	3666	4137	421	401	1017	954
	FEMALES							
Agricultural Sector	2.5	1.7	11.4	1.8	3.1	3.5	10.5	24.4
Industrial Sector (1)	20.2	15.2	10.0	11.4	31.3	22.4	36.9	27.9
Services Sector (2)	76.1	82.6	77.2	84.5	65.6	74.1	52.6	45.4
Total (100%)	254	408	70	219	32	58	38	86

u = urban, r = rural, O = origin, D = destination
(1) Includes divisions from 2 - 5
(2) Includes divisions from 6 - 9

Source: Computed from Special Migration Tables, EMS, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1979.

to rural areas either originating from urban (urban to rural) or rural (rural to rural) areas, the proportion engaged in agriculture has incresed from 37% at origin to 41% at destination for the former and decreased from 76% at origin to 69% at destination for the latter. The increase in the proportion working in agriculture in case of urban to rural male migrants may be explained by the differences in working life conditions between rural and urban areas since agriculture is the predominant activity in rural areas, but the decrease in such proportion in case of rural to rural male migrants may be due to other reasons which need further investigation in this respect. Perhaps some of this decrease has resulted from sectoral mobility of some of male migrants from agriculture to services (especially personal services and commerce).

By and large this analysis holds true in case of primary females working in agriculture. Those migrating to urban areas, especially rural to urban migrants, have experienced much decrease in the proportion working in agriculture at destination compared with origin whereas the reverse is true for those migrating to rural areas regardless of their origin (See Table 10).

On the other hand, the proportion of those engaged earlier in manufacturing (at origin) has greatly increased at destination in case of male migrants and especially for those migrating to urban areas. The increase, however, was much pronounced in case of rural to urban male migrants (from about 10% at origin

to 26% at destination) than in case of urban to urban ones (from 19% at origin to 23% at destination).

In general, female workers engaged in the industrial sector (as defined in Table 10) have relatively decreased at destination than at origin for each migration stream except rural to urban one. It seems that servcies are an easy entry into labour markets in case of females especially in urban areas.

The proportion working in services either among male or female migrants is much greater at destination than at origin. This is true for each migration stream except rural to rural one in case of females. However, the increase was more pronounced among migrants to urban areas than among those migrants to rural areas and among rural to urban ones than among any other migration stream.

The preceding analysis also holds true in case of workers in building and construction division and in commerce, hotels and restaurants (See Table 10).

One may conclude from these findings that the greatest changes in the industrial structure at destination seem to be experienced by working migrants involved in rural to urban migration stream followed by urban to urban one, rural to rural and urban to rural one. However, it should be mentioned here that some of the migrants involved in urban to rural stream are usually return migrants who might have failed in getting an urban job or in adapting themselves with the new life in urban areas or who are retired from the working life and wish

to spend the rest of their life in their home areas.

A comparison between primary male and female migrants in 1979 with total population aged 15 years and over in 1976 with respect to industry has revealed that the former are somewhat similar to the latter as far as industrial structure of migrants at their origin is considered. But, if the industrial structure of migrants at destination (in 1979) is to be compared with that of the population in 1976 then, the former will be in a relatively better situation than the latter in the sense that the proportion working in agricultural sector among migrants is lower than that among population whereas the reverse is true in case of industrial and services sectors, as can be clearly seen from Table (11).

Even if rural-urban residence is controlled, still migrants seem to be in a better industrial composition than the total population. For example, the proportion of rural male population working in agricultural sector in 1976 was about three quarters and that of females was slightly more than three fifths of total male and female population aged 15 years and over in this year, respectively, whereas that of rural male and female migrants in 1979 were 61% and 19% respectively. Also, the proportions of urban male and female population engaged in this sector in 1976 were 11% and 3% respectively as contrasted with 3% and 2% in case of urban male and female migrants in 1979 (See, Table 11 and the 1976 census, vol. 1, Table 3).

Thus, the preceding analysis clearly shows that internal

Table (11) - Working Primary Migrants by Sex and Industry at Origin and Destination Versus Active Population Aged 15 Years and over in 1976, Egypt, 1976 and 1979

(percentages)

Industrial Structure	Male Mig.		Female Mig.		Population	
	O	D	O	D	M	F
Agricultural Sector	40.6	11.2	4.8	4.4	46.3	14.5
Mining and Quarrying	0.3	0.7	0.3	--	0.4	0.2
Manufacturing	13.8	22.5	13.0	11.2	14.0	14.1
Elect., Gas & Water	1.5	2.0	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.8
Building & Construction	5.0	8.6	1.5	0.8	4.7	1.1
Industrical Sector	20.6	33.8	15.8	12.5	19.7	16.2
Commerce, Hotels	8.8	12.9	4.8	7.7	9.0	7.8
Trans. & Commun.	6.2	8.7	4.6	3.6	5.3	2.6
Finance, Insurance	1.0	1.5	3.3	2.8	0.8	2.8
Services	21.4	31.0	65.2	67.8	17.4	52.0
Services Sector	37.4	54.1	77.9	81.9	32.5	65.2
Not Adequately Described	1.4	0.9	1.5	1.2	1.5	4.1
Total (100%)	9353	9823	394	771	8644522	593861

O = origin and D = destination

Source: Computed from Special Migration Tables, EMS, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1979 for Primary Migrants and from the 1976 census, vol. 1, Table 14, p. 153 (The Total Republic), CAPMAS, Cairo, 1978 for the total population.

migration in Egypt leads to basic changes in the industrial structure of migrants involved and, that migrants at destination seem to be in a better industrial composition than the general population, both males and females. Also rural to urban migrants seem to have achieved the highest changes in this respect relative to other migration streams.

An attempt is made here to support this conclusion through studying the past industrial structure of male migrants cross classified according to their current situation. Female migrants are excluded from the analysis because of their small absolute numbers at origin (See Table 10). It is clear from Table (12) that out of those working in the agricultural sector at origin only about 14% were still working in this sector at destination (in 1979) in case of urban to urban male migrants. Such proportion was only 5% in case of rural to urban stream, whereas it was 80% in case of urban to rural and 82% in case of rural to rural working male migrants.

As expected, the great majority of those working in agriculture before migration to urban areas, regardless of their origin have experienced a large extent of sectoral mobility at destination. About two fifths in case of urban to urban stream and one half in case of rural to urban were currently engaged in services sector. Also, about one third of them for the former and two fifths for the latter were currently engaged in industrial sector and especially in the manufacturing division.

Table (12) - Past by Current Industry of Primary Working Male Migrants According to Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1979

Post Industry and Streams		Current Industry %			Total (1)	
		1	2	3	%	No.
urban	1. Agricul. Sector	13.8	33.9	41.4	100.0	767
to	2. Indust. Sector	1.1	80.9	11.2	100.0	1217
urban	3. Services Sector	1.0	6.1	78.3	100.0	2204
rural	1. Agricul. Sector	5.2	37.0	47.7	100.0	2105
to	2. Indust. Sector	0.4	76.1	16.8	100.0	547
urban	3. Services Sector	0.3	10.5	78.1	100.0	970
urban	1. Agricul. Sector	80.1	2.7	9.9	100.0	155
to	2. Indust. Sector	27.2	53.3	9.8	100.0	92
rural	3. Services Sector	8.6	3.1	79.1	100.0	163
rural	1. Agricul. Sector	82.1	2.2	7.1	100.0	772
to	2. Indust. Sector	7.0	81.7	7.0	100.0	71
rural	3. Services Sector	3.8	4.5	81.5	100.0	157

Note: The total of each stream does not include "Not Adequately Classified Activities" division.

(1) The difference from 100% represents those who are currently inactive.

Source: Special Migration Tables, EMS, Cairo, 1979.

Now, if it is clear from the preceding analysis that about 18% of working male migrants in urban to urban stream and 57% of those involved in rural to urban one were engaged in agriculture before their migration, hence it seems that migration has led to basic changes in their industrial structure at destination.

As regards those previously working in industrial sector, the great majority of them continued to work in this sector at destination for each migration stream. However, about one tenth of them in case of urban to urban migration and slightly less than one fifth in case of rural to urban have altered it to services sector. On the other hand, about one quarter of urban to rural male migrants working in industrial sector at origin were currently working in agriculture and about one tenth in services sector.

The preceding analysis holds true in case of those working in services sector at origin, where the great majority of them were still working in this sector at destination (See Table 12).

Interestingly, the downward trend to work in the agricultural sector at destination among those working in either industrial or services sectors at origin was almost negligible in case of migration to urban areas, but not so in case of migration to rural areas. In other words, upward sectoral mobility (working in non-agricultural sectors) was highly pronounced in case of migration to urban areas especially among

those originating from rural areas (rural to urban) than in case of migration to rural areas. This is completely consistent with what is documented in the literature about this issue (Zachariah, 1968; Brigg, 1973; Shaw, 1975; Standing, 1978).

B. Employment Status:

Very noticeable changes occurred in the employment status of primary migrants in 1979 as compared with that at origin. This is true for each migration stream and for both males and females especially for those migrating to urban areas regardless of their origin, as can be seen from Table (13).

For example, the proportion of paid employees among active male migrants originating from urban areas and migrating to urban areas (urban to urban) has increased from 68% at origin to 79% at destination (in 1979) - an increase of 11 percentage points, whereas that among active male migrants involved in rural to urban migration stream has increased from 46% at origin to 82% at destination - an increase of 36 percentage points. Conversely, the proportion of employees among active male migrants in urban to rural stream has decreased from 70% at origin to 56% at destination - a decrease of 14 percentage points, whereas that among active male migrants in rural to rural stream has decreased from 52% at origin to 44% at destination - a decrease of 8 percentage points.

Table (13) - Percentage Distribution of Active Primary Migrants by Sex, Employment Status at Origin and Destination and Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1979

Employment Status	u → u		r → u		u → r		r → r	
	O	D	O	D	O	D	O	D
	MALES							
Own Account work.	10.4	13.0	12.5	12.6	12.2	19.8	23.7	22.7
Employers	3.6	6.9	2.3	4.6	8.7	20.8	10.6	33.1
Employees	67.6	79.3	46.1	82.1	70.3	56.2	51.7	43.5
Unpaid Family work.	8.8	0.4	23.9	0.3	5.5	2.5	11.8	0.6
Unemployed	9.6	0.4	15.1	0.4	3.2	0.7	2.2	0.1
Total (100%)	4702	4350	4319	4156	435	404	1040	955
	FEMALES							
Own Account work.	1.4	4.3	1.8	11.7	3.8	7.9	16.0	18.0
Employers	0.6	1.7	--	1.4	--	4.8	--	11.2
Employees	67.6	90.3	55.8	84.7	50.9	66.7	52.0	46.1
Unpaid Family work.	1.4	0.5	4.4	0.9	5.7	12.7	8.0	21.3
Unemployed	29.1	3.3	38.1	1.3	39.6	7.9	24.0	3.4
Total (100%)	358	422	113	222	53	63	50	89

Source: Computed from Special Migration Tables, EMS, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1979.

Also, the proportion of employees among active female migrants to urban areas has considerably increased at destination over that at origin. The increase was, however, much pronounced in case of rural to urban stream than in case of urban to urban one, like what is noticed in case of males. The reason for this is that unemployment rates among educated persons were much higher at origin for the former stream than for the latter, as will be seen later on. Those educated persons are more likely to work for pay or profit at destination and thus, to be classified as paid employees.

On the other hand, the percentage of employees among active female migrants in rural to rural stream has decreased at destination (in 1979) whereas that among urban to rural ones has increased probably because the former are less educated than the latter.

A significant decrease in the unemployment rates has been noticed at destination for each migration stream and for both males and females. The most noticeable decrease in this respect is recorded for active male migrants in rural to urban stream where the rate of unemployment has decreased from 15% at origin to only 0.4% at destination. Corresponding decrease in case of urban to urban active male migrants was from 10% at origin to only 0.4% at destination. Also, the decrease in the unemployment rates at destination is clearly noticeable for male migrants to rural areas as well as for active female migrants involved in each migration stream.

On the other hand, the proportions of unpaid family workers among migrants in each migration stream have significantly decreased at destination as compared with origin, as far as active males are concerned. However, the decrease is much more pronounced among active male migrants to urban areas and especially rural to urban ones than among active male migrants to rural areas. This holds true in case of active female migrants to urban areas but not in case of those migrating to rural areas.

In addition, the higher proportion of own account workers and unpaid family workers at destination among active migrants to rural areas than among those migrating to urban areas, both males and females, may due to differentials in employment opportunities between urban and rural areas, as noted earlier.

A comparison between primary active migrants in 1979 and active population aged 15 years and over in 1976 with respect to employment status is presented in Table (14). It is clear from this table that the former are in a relatively better status than the latter in the sense that employees are more pronounced among migrants than among population whereas, the reverse is true in case of unemployed, and own account workers. For example, paid employees represented about three quarters of active male migrants at destination as contrasted with 65% in case of male population in 1976. The corresponding proportions in case of active females were 82% for migrants in 1979 and 76% for population in 1976. This is because agriculture

Table (14) - Active Primary Migrants by Sex and Employment Status at Origin and Destination in 1979 versus Active Population Aged 15 years and over in 1976, Egypt, 1976 and 1979

(percentages)

Employment Status	Male Mig.		Female Mig.		Population	
	O	D	O	D	M	F
Own Account Workers	12.7	14.0	3.0	8.2	22.0	6.9
Employers	4.0	9.0	0.3	2.9	9.6	2.0
Employees	57.3	76.0	62.4	81.9	65.0	75.5
Unpaid Family Workers (1)	15.2	0.5	3.0	3.9	--	--
Unemployed	10.9	0.4	31.4	3.1	3.4	15.6
Total (100%)	10496	9865	574	796	8834426	695912

O = origin and D = destination

(1) The non-existence of unpaid family workers in case of population aged 15 years and over in 1976 census is highly questionable and needs further investigation.

Source: Computed from Special Migration Tables, EMS, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1979 for Primary Migrants and from the 1976 census, vol. 1, Table 8 (The Total Republic), CAPMAS, Cairo, 1978 for the total population.

was the predominant economic activity among population in 1976 where own account workers and employers seem to be more pronounced than in case of non-agricultural activities.

Also, the unemployment rate among active male migrants in 1979 (about 0.4%) was significantly lower than that among

active male population in 1976 (about 3.4%). The corresponding rates in case of active female migrants and active female population were 3% and 16% respectively. Since migrants could be expected to be relatively more prepared or determined to work in various informal sectors, low status and low income activities under certain circumstances, their unemployment rates tend to be lower than that of the active population (see also, Herrick, 1965; Shaw, 1975).

In addition, the proportion of own account workers among active male migrants in 1979 was much lower (14%) than that among active male population in 1976 (about 22%). Such proportions, however, are about the same in case of females.

Thus, the preceding analysis shows that migration leads to basic changes in the employment status of migrants involved and to a considerable decrease in their unemployment rates especially in case of those migrating to urban areas. Also, migrants are noticed to be in a relatively better employment status than the general population.

This, can be further supported by studying the past employment status of migrants cross classified by their current status. For reasons already mentioned earlier only active male migrants are considered here. It is clear from Table (15) that about three fifths of own account workers at origin continued to be so classified at destination, whereas about one fourth of them became employees and 7% became employers in case of urban to urban migrants. Interestingly, in case of rural

Table (15) - Past by Current Employment Status of Primary Male Migrants According to Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1979

Past Emp. Status and Streams	Current Emp. Status %						Total (100%)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	1. Urban to urban						
1. Own Account work.	61.1	6.5	23.1	--	0.2	9.6	490
2. Employers	2.5	67.9	17.0	--	--	12.6	169
3. Employees	4.8	2.7	80.2	0.1	0.1	12.1	3178
4. Unpaid family work.	15.6	7.5	63.6	3.0	0.5	9.8	412
5. Unemployed	6.7	3.1	83.8	0.2	0.7	5.4	453
6. Inactive (*)	6.5	3.5	62.7	0.5	1.5	25.4	227
	2. Rural to urban						
1. Own Account work.	38.0	4.6	44.9	0.4	0.6	11.5	539
2. Employers	5.9	50.5	25.7	--	--	17.8	101
3. Employees	8.0	2.5	80.0	0.1	0.2	9.3	1992
4. Unpaid family work.	10.5	4.4	75.0	0.6	0.3	9.3	1034
5. Unemployed	3.8	2.0	89.7	0.5	0.5	3.5	653
6. Inactive (*)	7.6	2.4	74.9	0.4	2.8	12.0	251
	3. Urban to rural						
1. Own Account work.	69.8	15.1	11.3	--	--	3.8	53
2. Employers	5.3	81.6	5.3	--	--	7.9	38
3. Employees	9.3	8.6	71.7	0.7	0.4	9.3	306
4. Unpaid family work.	16.7	50.0	16.7	4.2	--	12.5	24
5. Unemployed	14.3	7.1	78.6	--	--	--	14
6. Inactive (*)	20.0	20.0	20.0	--	--	40.0	5
	4. Rural to rural						
1. Own Account work.	58.1	9.8	16.7	--	0.4	15.0	246
2. Employers	0.9	87.3	4.5	--	--	7.3	110
3. Employees	7.6	26.2	58.2	0.4	--	7.6	538
4. Unpaid family work.	25.2	43.9	26.8	2.4	--	1.6	123
5. Unemployed	4.3	4.3	78.3	4.3	--	8.5	23
6. Inactive (*)	--	--	45.5	--	--	54.5	11

Table (15):

(*) Includes Students, income recipients, unable to work, old age and retired persons.

Source: Special Migration Tables, EMS, Cairo, 1979.

to urban ones, only two fifths of the stated status continued to be so classified at destination, whereas 45% became employees and 5% became employers. Hence, the degree of relative mobility in this respect seems to be higher among the latter than among the former.

A similar conclusion could be reached in case of unpaid family workers and unemployed. The great majority of migrants so classified at origin, became employees at destination either in case of urban to urban or rural to urban male migrants. However, the percentage of employees at destination was much higher among the latter than among the former.

On the other hand, the great majority of own account workers at origin continued to be so classified at destination for both urban to rural and rural to rural male migrants, whereas slightly more than three quarters of the unemployed at origin became employees at destination for both streams. A considerable proportion of unpaid family workers at origin became either employers, own account workers or employees at destination for these two streams (See Table 15).

A final important point to be clarified here, is that the

proportion of inactive migrants (students, income recipients, unable to work, etc.) at origin has considerably decreased at destination especially in case of migration to urban areas. The greatest decrease in this respect has been recorded for rural to urban male migrants where only about one tenth of inactive males at origin are so classified at destination. Such proportion was one fourth for urban to urban stream.

Also, the inactive male migrants at destination represented about two fifths of those so classified at origin in case of urban to rural migration and slightly more than one half in case of rural to rural ones. However, the absolute numbers of these inactive migrants were very small in both cases.

C. Occupational Status:

The occupational structure of the labour force presents an inventory of the skilled exercised by the workers of a particular nation and hence, helps the planners in assessing development needs in educational system, vocational training and rehabilitation programmes, and other means of equiliberating labour supply and demand in the different occupational categories. It is often used as an indicator of the socio-economic status of a population and can be used alone or in combination with other data in studying social mobility, fertility and mortality differentials, patterns of consumers' expenditures and other sociological, demographic and economic questions too

numerous to list (See UN, 1968 and 1979).

To what extent did migration affect the occupational status and thus, the socio-economic status of primary migrants in 1979? To answer this question Table (16) is prepared to examine the occupational status of primary migrants involved in basic migration streams before and after the migration process, i.e., at origin and destination. This table clearly shows that the occupational status of employed male migrants has undergone basic changes at destination (in 1979) compared with that at origin for each migration stream especially in case of migration to urban areas and more specifically for rural to urban migration stream. The proportions of workers classified as professionals and related workers; administrative and related workers; clerical workers; sales workers and services workers among employed male migrants have significantly increased at destination as compared with those at origin for all migration streams. However, the increase in such proportions are more pronounced among male migrants to urban areas than among male migrants to rural areas and among rural to urban migration stream in particular. Also, the increase in case of services, sales, and clerical workers was much higher than in case of professionals and related workers or than in case of administrative and related workers.

On the other hand, a significant decrease in the proportions of workers classified as farmers and related workers among employed male migrants have occurred at destination rel-

Table (16) - Percentage Distribution of Employed Primary Migrants by Sex, Occupational Status at Origin and Destination and Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1979

Occupational Status	u → u		r → u		u → r		r → r	
	O	D	O	D	O	D	O	D
	MALES							
Professionals and Related	15.6	17.2	5.0	10.4	7.5	9.6	4.0	5.6
Administ. and Related	3.2	5.7	0.7	2.6	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.6
Clerical workers	13.5	15.4	6.0	12.4	7.9	8.2	2.4	3.8
Sales workers	8.6	9.6	6.4	12.0	5.3	5.5	2.2	2.4
Services workers	11.8	15.5	5.7	19.9	15.1	16.0	6.7	9.2
Farmers and Related	17.3	2.3	57.3	2.6	34.9	38.0	74.2	65.8
Craftsmen and Labourers	30.0	34.3	18.9	40.1	29.1	21.9	10.2	12.6
Total (100%)	4221	4319	3647	4122	418	400	1014	952
	FEMALES							
White-collar workers (1)	80.9	78.4	64.3	57.1	68.8	74.1	47.4	40.6
Services workers	11.6	16.5	15.7	34.7	9.4	3.5	7.9	7.1
Blue-collar workers (2)	7.5	5.1	20.0	8.2	21.8	22.4	44.7	52.3
Total (100%)	253	407	70	219	32	58	38	84

u = urban, r = rural, O = origin and D = destination

(1) Includes major groups from 1 - 4
(2) Includes major groups 6 and 7 (where 7 in turn includes 7, 8 and 9 major groups in the ISCO)

Source: Computed from Special Migration Tables, EMS, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1979.

ative to those at origin for all migration streams except urban to rural one. Again, the decrease is considerable in case of rural to urban male migrants (about 54 percentage points) and urban to urban ones (about 14 percentage points). This seems in great consistency with what is mentioned earlier in case of industrial structure of those migrants.

An increase in the proportions of craftsmen and labourers among employed male migrants are also noticed at destination for all streams except urban to rural one. Reasons for the deviaiton of urban to rural stream from other streams are already mentioned earlier.

Although the occupational structure of urban to urban male migrants seems to be relatively better than that of rural to urban ones at both origin and destination - in the sense that white-collar occupations are more representative among the former than among the latter whereas the reverse is true in case of blue-collar occupations - it seems that rural to urban male migrants have achieved more steps towards upward occupational mobility at destination relative to their situation at origin than urban to urban ones. This point will be studied in more detail in another study.

As regards employed female migrants the situation is somewhat different due to their small absolute numbers and especially in case of migration to rural areas regardless of its origin (See Table 16). The proportions of white-collar occupations among them have decreased at destination than at origin

for all streams except urban to urban one. Also, the proportions of employed females classified as services workers have increased in case of migration to urban areas but not so in case of migration to rural areas regardless of their origin.

On the other hand, the proportions of blue-collar workers among employed female migrants have decreased at destination in case of migration to urban areas and increased in case of migration to rural areas whether originating from urban or rural areas.

Although some of these results may seem reasonable in case of employed female migrants, given the differentials in employment opportunities between urban and rural areas, one cannot reach to any general conclusion in this respect due to the very small absolute numbers of employed female migrants at origin and especially in case of rural migration, as noted above.

A comparison between employed primary migrants in 1979 and employed non-migrants and total population aged 15 years and over in 1976 with respect to occupational status is expressed in terms of migration differentials between them and is presented in Table (17). Interestingly, the index of migration differentials, as defined earlier, has clearly shown that primary migrants, both males and females, were in a relatively better occupational status in 1979 than either non-migrants or total population in 1976, both males and females, in the previous sense. In other words, employed male and

Table (17) - Differentials[1] Between Employed Primary Migrants in 1979 and Employed Non-migrants and Population aged 15 years and over in 1976 by Sex and Occupational Status, Egypt, 1976 and 1979

Occupational Status	Between Mig. and Non-mig.		Between Mig. and Pop.	
	M	F	M	F
Professionals and Related	174.5	69.5	103.0	47.9
Administrative and Related	428.6	14.3	236.4	- 5.9
Clerical Workers	149.0	15.0	98.4	11.4
Sales Workers	59.0	30.0	44.8	38.3
White-collar Workers	134.9	42.3	92.1	31.6
Services Workers	143.5	198.5	102.4	116.5
Farmers and Related	- 80.6	- 79.1	- 77.1	- 73.0
Craftsmen and Labourers	74.9	0.0	52.2	12.2
Blue-collar Workers	- 38.3	- 48.5	- 33.6	- 37.1

[1] The index of migration differentials is defined earlier under Table (8).

Source: Computed from Table (11) for primary migrants and from the 1976 census, vols. 1 and 2, The Total Republic, CAPMAS, Cairo, 1978 for non-migrants and total population.

female migrants in 1979 were more representative in each major occupational group than both male and female non-migrants or total population except in farmers and related workers group where the latter were more representative than the former.

This analysis highly supports the preceding conclusions that primary migrants at destination were in a relatively better industrial composition and employment status than the general population in 1976. As such, one may generally conclude that internal migration in Egypt especially that directed to urban areas has led to a relative improvement in the socio-economic status of primary migrants involved. More specifically, rural to urban primary migrants seem to have achieved the highest relative improvement in this regard compared with other migration streams. This conclusion is supported by many other empirical studies (See for example, Brigg, 1973; Simmons et al, 1977; Sabot, 1982).

Again, this conclusion can be further supported by studying the occupational mobility of primary migrants, i.e., comparing the occupational status of the same persons at two different dates (before and after the migration process). Only male migrants are discussed here for reasons already mentioned earlier. Table (18) is prepared for this purpose, i.e., to show past by current occupational status of primary male migrants. For sake of simplicity only three broad occupational groups are shown in this table, i.e., white-collar workers; services workers and blue-collar workers (See remark under Table

Table (18) - Past by Current Occupational Status of Employed Primary Male Migrants According to Basic Migration Streams, Egypt, 1979

	Past Occup. Status and Streams	Current Occup. %			Total	
		1	2	3	%	No.
u/u	1. White-collar work.	79.3	2.7	4.0	100.0	1723
	2. Services work.	5.6	68.6	9.3	100.0	497
	3. Blue-collar work.	11.0	12.1	67.6	100.0	2001
R/u	1. White-collar work.	74.7	5.4	9.2	100.0	661
	2. Services work.	10.1	63.3	13.5	100.0	207
	3. Blue-collar work.	15.9	21.7	52.7	100.0	2779
u/R	1. White-collar work.	85.1	3.5	8.1	100.0	87
	2. Services work.	--	66.7	15.9	100.0	63
	3. Blue-collar work.	5.6	6.0	80.2	100.0	268
R/R	1. White-collar work.	86.7	1.1	5.6	100.0	90
	2. Services work.	4.4	67.6	11.8	100.0	68
	3. Blue-collar work.	2.5	4.4	84.7	100.0	856

(1) The difference from 100% represents those who are currently without occupation mostly because of retirement.

Source: Special Migration Tables, EMS, Cairo, 1979.

16).

It is clear from Table (18) that the predominant majority of white-collar workers at origin had continued to be so classified at destination (in 1979). For example, about four-fifths of those previously classified in white-collar workers groups at origin, continued to be so classified at destination for urban to urban male migrants. The corresponding proportion in case of rural to urban migration was about three quarters. Also, about 4% of those previously engaged in white-collar workers at origin had transferred into blue-collar workers group and another 3% into services workers group, as far as urban to urban male migrants are concerned. The corresponding proportions in case of rural to urban migrants were 9% and 5% repectively.

On the other hand, those previously engaged in blue-collar occupations had undergone some basic improvements in their occupational status in 1979 especially in case of migration to urban areas regardless of its origin. Only about two thirds in case of urban to urban migrants who were previously classified as blue-collar workers, and about one half in case of rural to urban ones had continued to be so classified at destination. The rest in each case had transferred into higher status occupations either into services or white-collar ones (See Table 18).

Interestingly, blue-collar workers represented nearly half of total working male migrants involved in urban to urban stream

at origin, and about three quarters of rural to urban migrants. Hence, the upward mobility for this group of migrants seems to be much higher for the latter (38%) than for the former (23%). This also holds true for migrants to rural areas but, with a very small degree of upward occupational mobility, i.e., about 12% in case of urban to rural migrants who were classified as blue-collar workers at origin and only 7% in case of rural to rural males.

Of those previously working in services occupations at origin, one tenth had moved to white-collar group at destination in case of rural to urban migrants; 6% in case of urban to urban and about 4% in case of rural to rural migrants. Also, 14% of those previously working in services group at origin had transferred into blue-collar workers in case of rural to urban migration; 9% in case of urban to urban; and 12% in case of rural to rural migrants. Nevertheless, services workers group represented only 6% of rural to urban male workers at origin; 12% of urban to urban and 7% of rural to rural working male migrants at origin.

Thus, judging from these upward and downward movements as well as the relative size of each occupational group in the total occupational groups of migrants concerned, it seems that upward occupational mobility among working male migrants was relatively greater than downward mobility, especially for migrants to urban areas. Even so, the upward occupational mobility, on the whole, was much more pronounced among rural to

urban than among urban to urban employed male migrants. This is consistent with what is noticed earlier in case of industrial structure and employment status of primary male migrants. It is also consistent with what is documented in the literature in this respect, as noted earlier.

Perhaps a better judgment about the impact of migration on the occupational promotion of migrants involved may be through studying past by current occupational status of migrants employed at both dates (before and after migration process) as well as the current occupational status of those migrants who are currently employed (in 1979) but no so at origin (before migration). These points, however, needs further investigation and will be treated in more detail in another study.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS:

This study about the size and characteristics of primary migrants in Egypt has revealed some basic interesting points as follows:

1. Primary male migrants to urban areas of Egypt represented the great majority of all primary male migrants (more than four-fifths) whereas primary female migrants to rural areas represented more than one half of all primary female migrants in 1979. All together, primary migrants were about 7% of the total surveyed population in this year.

2. Urban to urban primary migrants were about the same in their size as rural to urban ones (about one third each of the total primary migrants) in 1979.

3. Not less than one third of primary migrants in 1979 were recent migrants as compared with about one half of migrants in 1976. The remainder in both cases are settled migrants.

4. The predominance of young adults and youth among primary migrants at the time of migration. Also, primary migrants were more representative in the working age groups than the total population in 1976.

5. Single and married primary migrants were about the same before migration but, after migration the great majority of them were married. Migration seems to have a small or no impact on the marital status of migrants involved.

6. Primary migrants in 1979 seemed to be in an intermediate position between rural and urban populations in 1976 with respect to educational status in general. But, starting from intermediate level of education and over migrants were better educated than population both in rural and urban areas. Also, migration seems to have led to some improvement in the educational status of primary migrants at destination compared with that at origin especially in case of urban migrants regardless of their origin.

7. Primary migrants were mostly engaged in agricultural sector and services before migration but, after it they were more representative in non-agricultural activities and not so in

agricultural activity especially for those migrating to urban areas and more specifically for rural to urban migrants. Also, primary migrants in 1979 seemed to be in a relatively better industrial structure than the general population in 1976.

8. Own account workers, unpaid family workers and employers were more pronounced among primary migrants before migration than after it whereas the reverse is true in case of paid employees. Also, the unemployment rates among primary migrants have decreased to a very large extent due to their migration and the likelihood that they may accept certain kind of work for less pay and profit under certain circumstances. Furthermore, primary migrants at destination (in 1979) seemed to be in a relatively better status than the general population in 1976 and especially in case of those migrating to urban areas regardless of their origin.

9. Internal migration has led to basic changes in the occupational status of primary migrants. White-collar occupations were more representative among primary migrants at destination than at origin whereas, the reverse is true in case of blue-collar ones, especially for migrants to urban areas. Also, primary migrants in 1979 were in a relatively better occupational status than both the general population and non-migrants in 1976.

10. In any case, rural to urban primary migrants seem to have achieved the highest changes and thus, the highest relative

improvement in their socio-economic status at destination relative to origin as compared with other migration streams. This point, however, needs further investigation and will be the topic of another detailed study. . .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study has been made possible through a Fellowship granted to me by Middle East Research Awards in Population and Development (MEAwards) and the Central Agency for Public Mobilisation and Statistics (CAPMAS), to whom I am indeed very grateful.

I also wish to express my unreserved indebtedness to Dr. A. M. Hallouda, President of CAPMAS and Chairman of the Cairo Demographic Center Governing Council, for allowing me to use the yet unpublished detailed results of the 1979 Sample Survey of Internal Migration Differentiations in Egypt (EMS). He has been a constant source of encouragement and inspiration. I am indeed very grateful to him.

Thanks are also due to Professor Ann Miller, Chair of Graduate Group in Demography, Population Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania, for her extensive comments, invaluable suggestions, cooperation and thoughtful guidance throughout the preparation of this paper.

Simmons, Alan; Diaz Briquets, Sergio and Lanquian, Aprodico, Social Change and Internal Migration, A Review of Research Findings from Africa, Asia and Latin America. International Development Research Center (IDRC-TS6e), Ottawa, 1977.

Standing, Guy, Labour Force Participation and Development. ILO, Geneva, 1978.

UN, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Methods of Analysing Census Data on Economic Activities of the Population. Population Studies, No. 43, New York, 1968.

_____, Methods of Measuring Internal Migration. Population Studies, No. 47, New York, 1970.

_____, Draft Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses. Statistical Commission, Twentieth Session, New York, 1979.

_____, Sample Surveys of Current Interest (Fourteenth Report). Series C, No. 15, New York, 1982.

Zachariah, K.C., Migrants in Greater Bombay. Research Monograph, No. 5, Demographic Training and Research Center, Bombay, 1968.

REFERENCES CITED

Adepoju, Aderanti, "Migration and Socio-Economic Change In Africa". International Social Science Journal, vol. XXXI, No. 2, 1979, pp. 207-225.

Brigg, Pamela, "Some Economic Interpretation of Case Studies of Urban Migration In Developing Countries". World Bank Working Paper No. 151, Washington, D.C., 1973.

CAPMAS, The 1976 General Pop. and Housing Census, The Total Republic, vols. 1 and 2, Cairo, 1978.

_____, The Preliminary Results of Internal Migration Differentiations Sample Survey of 1979, Cairo, 1979.

CDC, Urbanization and Migration in Some Arab and African Countries. Research Monograph Series, No. 4, Cairo, 1973.

Claeson, C.F. and Egero, B., "Migration". In Henin, R.A. and Egero, B. (Eds.), The Population of Tanzania, An Analysis of the 1967 Population Census, Census vol. 6, BRALUP and Bureau of Statistics, Dar es Salaam, 1973, pp. 56-75.

Connell, J., Dadgupta, B., Laishley, R. and Lipton, M., Migration from Rural Areas: The Evidence from Village Studies. Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1975.

Herrick, B., Uban Migration and Economic Development In Chile. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1965.

Kosniski, Leszek and Prothero, R. Mansell, People on the Move. Methuen Co. Ltd., London, 1974.

Lee, Everett S., "A Theory of Migration". Demography, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1966, pp. 47-57.

Nassif, A., The Egyptian Labour Force: Its Dimensions and Changing Structure, 1907-1960. Analytical and Technical Reports, No. 9, University of Pennsylvania, Population Studies Center, Philadelphia, 1974.

Sabot, Richard H., Migration and the Labour Market in Developing Countries. Westview Press Inc., Boulder, Colorado, USA, 1982.

Shaw, R.P., Migration Theory and Facts, A Review and Bibliography of Current Literature. Regional Science Research Institute, Philadelphia, 1975.