

PATTERNS OF MIGRATION: SOME FINDINGS FROM ANALYSIS BASED ON URBAN TO RURAL RETURN MIGRANTS IN KOREA*

Choi Jin-Ho & Kwon Tai-Hwan

This paper examines several issues related to the general migration process utilizing the residential mobility history of the respondents based on data from a sample survey of three rural towns in a south-eastern part of Korea.

The analysis disclosed that total mobility of the return migrants was low. Total mobility was affected by the physical distance between place of origin and destination. Direct rural to urban movement appeared to be the prevalent pattern of previous migration among return migrants. However, some migrants experienced a type of stage migration. Physical distance between origin and final destination, and the level of societal development were found to be important in accounting for stage migration. On the average, one in ten return migrants experienced circular movement. The analysis also revealed some differences in the process of movement between the initial move to the city and the return move, and also between the moves to and from the remote capital city of Seoul and the nearby provincial capital of Daegu. Among respondents who had intended to reside permanently in the city although in fact they returned later, a strong preference toward the living in the city was found. Besides greater job opportunities in the city, the better education facilities of the city are found to have attracted the migrants, suggesting that creating job opportunities in rural areas is not sufficient for inducing and retaining the population.

I. INTRODUCTION

Until recently, there has been little interest in return migration. Rather migration researchers have largely concentrated on the causes and the process of initial rural to urban move, or focused on the analysis of the overall migration streams without any breakdown of different types of movement. However, a number of studies have stressed the urgent need for the analysis of return migration separately from assessment of other types of movement (Goldstein, 1954, 1964; Goldscheider, 1971). In fact, many investigators have recognized that the causes and nature of return migration may differ from other types of migration. For example, Eldridge (1965) has classified migrants into three types: primary, secondary and return migrants, and argued that any theory of migration should recognize that the three types of migration have distinctive age characteristics. Miller (1977) pointed out that the decision to move is very probably governed by different considerations for individuals undertaking each type of move. Also a number of econometric studies of migration have stressed that return and nonreturn migrants respond quite differently to the factors that condition migration decisions (Vanderkamp, 1971, 1972; Miller, 1973; DaVanzo, 1976, 1978; Kiker and Traynham, 1976; Kau and Sirmans, 1976, 1978).

Recently, more research emphasis has also been placed upon circular and return migration

* This is a preliminary report of the findings from a larger study on Determinants and Consequences of Urban to Rural Return Migration in Korea. This research was supported by the Program on Population and Development Policy of the Ford and the Rockefeller Foundation and a grant by Korean Traders Scholarship Foundation.

in the context of total mobility of the population (Hugo, 1975; Goldstein, 1978). This change has been brought by the increasing recognition that a large proportion of actual movement has been ignored in their analysis simply due to the lack of appropriate data. For instance, Goldstein (1978) noted that stability of rural population has often been cited as a characteristic of many countries; but whether this reflects the actual behavior of the population or is largely an artifact of the data available for analysis has justifiably begun to be questioned. Among the movements frequently not revealed by traditional census data on migration, circular and return migration are typical.

This analysis first examines several issues related to the general migration process utilizing the residential mobility history of the respondents. Stage migration and circular movement are of particular interest. Then, it deals with two specific moves; the initial move to Seoul/Daegu, and the return move to the province of birth. The major concern is how these two moves differ from each other with respect to the purpose of move and the process of movement itself. Also comparisons are made to ascertain whether the behavior of migrants who moved to and returned from the remote capital city of Seoul differ from migrants to and from the nearby provincial capital city of Daegu.

II. DATA

This analysis is based on data from a sample survey of three rural towns in Gyeongsangbugdo province. The survey was conducted during the summer of 1978; the respondents consisted of return migrants, migrants and natives of the study area. The major purposes of the study are to identify the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of urban to rural return migrants in Korea; to examine factors affecting return migrants' decision to move back to their place of origin; and to investigate the consequences of return migration for the individual return migrants and for the community of origin and destination.

In order to evaluate the effect of the government's population redistribution policies and to increase the generality of the study results, three study areas were selected purposively. The first is Gumi Shi in which a newly established industrial site is located. Since 1971 when a industrial site was first established, the population increased more than three times from 23 thousand in 1970 to 72 thousand in 1977. Due to this fast population growth, the area gained city status from town(Eup) in early 1978. The industrial site, which is located about 3 miles away from the central city area, consists mostly of textile and electronics factories. The second is Jeomcheon Eup which was evaluated as successful in the New Community Movement by the government. The New Community Movement is a nationwide campaign for modernization started in 1970. One of the aims of the Movement is to increase rural earnings through such as building small scale labor intensive industries and introducing better cash crops. Thus the Movement should have an effect of discouraging outmigration from rural areas as well as inducing return movement. Jeomcheon is a mining and commercial town around which a number of coal mines and cement industries are located. The area shows relatively stable population growth since 1956 when the area was designated as Eup. The third study area is Hayang Eup which was selected to provide a contrasting type of location. Hayang is a small agricultural town located very close to the provincial capital city, Daegu.

The field interview was conducted for a sample of males at least 23 years of age at the time of the survey. The sample was to encompass return migrants, migrants and natives. Each group of respondents was identified by and selected from the household canvass survey and from Civil Registration Records. Return migrants were defined as those who were born in rural areas of Gyeongsangbugdo province and were living in Seoul or Daegu at the time of the 1970 census (October, 1970), or were living in Seoul on November 1974 over three months.

Migrants were those who were born outside of each study area, and natives were those who were born in each study area and who never migrated to any location outside the area.

The reason for fixing the time point of living in cities of return migrants is to ensure the comparability of the survey data to other data; these include the 1970 population census of Korea conducted on October 1970 and the Seoul City Migration Survey sponsored by Brown University and conducted by Sarah Green in 1974. Seoul is the largest capital city of Korea. The population of Seoul was 6.9 million in 1975. Its distance from each study area is 174, 196 and 217 miles for Gumi, Jeomchon and Hayang, respectively. Daegu is the third largest city of the country and a provincial capital city of Gyeongsangbugdo province. The population of Daegu was 1.3 million at the time of the 1975 census, and Daegu is 29, 81 and 13 miles away from Gumi, Jeomchon and Hayang, respectively. In all 285 return migrants, 270 migrants and 300 natives were interviewed. The current analysis is based on information obtained for 285 return migrants; 137 from Seoul and 148 from Daegu.

III. PATTERNS CHARACTERIZING TOTAL MOVEMENT

Total Number of Moves

In the survey schedule every different place of residence, classified by Shi, Myon or Eup level, in which a respondent lived for at least three months since birth was recorded. Therefore, for measuring the number of moves, a move is defined as any crossing of a boundary of a Shi, Myon or Eup for the purpose of residing at least three months in the new place. Shi is an administratively defined city which has a population over 50,000. The population size of Myon is normally under 20,000 and that of a Eup is between 20,000 and 50,000. The three months period was used because the 1970 Korean census employed it for delineating the resident population of the area. Moves for army service are excluded. By definition, return migrants would have had to make at least two moves during their lifetime, one to leave their birthplace to go to Seoul or Daegu and a second to return to the current town of residence.

In all, just under half of the return migrants made only two moves during their life time (see Table 1), and another fourth made three moves. Only 13.6 percent moved five or more times. One case reported as many as 17 moves. But on the whole, these data suggest a relatively limited amount of movement. An average of 2.6 moves were made by the respondents. It is generally held that total mobility rates are very sensitive to the temporal and spatial units used in defining migration, and that the level of mobility rises as the length of the temporal and the size of the spatial unit are reduced (Goldstein, 1978). Considering the fact that relatively small spatial units and short time periods have been used for defining a move, and that the sample consisted entirely of return migrants which, as indicated, means that all migrants made at

Table 1. Total Number of Moves in Lifetime for Return Migrants from Seoul and Daegu

Number of Moves	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
2	39.4	56.1	48.1
3	27.7	21.6	24.3
4	17.5	10.8	14.0
5	6.6	7.4	7.0
6	5.8	1.4	3.5
7 or more	2.9	2.8	3.1
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	137	148	285
Median number of move	2.9	2.4	2.6
Mean number of years per place lived	8.7	10.5	9.5

least two moves, the average of 2.6 moves for the total sample reflects low mobility.

Return migrants from Seoul moved more than the return migrants from Daegu (2.9 *versus* 2.4 moves). Since Seoul is located far from the province in which return migrants were born, and is the largest city of the country, it is not surprising that the migrants to and from Seoul had more moves. But since the number of total moves is for the lifetime period, it is much affected by the current age of the respondent. Therefore, to eliminate age effect, mean duration of residence in each place was calculated dividing current age by number of places in which the migrants lived. For all migrants, this averaged 9.5 years per place. However, the mean length of duration also shows that the typical return migrant from Seoul was more mobile than the typical return migrant from Daegu, averaging only 8.7 years per place compared to 10.5 years respectively.

Stage Migration

It has often been hypothesized that in developing countries many migrants reach their final destination only after a sequence of moves. Villagers may first move to a nearby town, and after spending some time there they move again to a local city or regional capital city, and then move to the capital city of the country (Simmons, *et al.*, 1977). Availability of life history data allow testing whether any such pattern characterized the return migrants.

Table 2 gives some evidences on stage migration in Korea. It shows that 52.6 percent of return migrants from Seoul and 70.3 percent from Daegu moved directly to the city from their birthplace. Another 14.6 percent and 14.8 percent moved directly to Seoul and Daegu from rural areas other than their birthplace. Therefore, altogether 67.2 percent and 85.1 percent of the migrants to Seoul and Daegu respectively moved from rural areas directly to the city. This indicates that direct rural to urban movement is prevalent in Korea, at least among those who later became return migrants.

Table 2. Stage of Move from Birthplace to the City

Stage of Move	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
Direct from rural area			
Birthplace	67.2	85.1	76.5
Other rural area	52.6	70.3	61.8
Through urban area	14.6	14.8	14.7
Seoul	32.8	14.9	23.5
Daegu	—	6.8	*
City within the province	19.0	—	*
City outside the province	8.8	3.4	*
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	137	148	285

However, some migrants did experience a type of stage migration in that they passed through other urban areas on their way to Seoul or Daegu. About 33 percent of the migrants to Seoul and 15 percent of the migrants to Daegu experienced urban living before they moved to Seoul/Daegu. Nineteen percent of the migrants to Seoul once lived in Daegu, 8.8 percent lived in a city in Gyeongsangbugdo province, and 10.2 percent once lived in a city in the other provinces. Since some migrants lived in two or more cities before they moved to Seoul, the percent of migrants moving through urban areas is less than the sum of percentages lived in each urban category. It is interesting to see that almost half of the indirect migrants to Daegu passed through Seoul, even though Seoul is so far away from the province.

It is not surprising that more stage migration occurred among migrants to Seoul than to Daegu, for Seoul is located far from the province from which the migrant originated. It can

also be assumed that stage migration, as a pattern of movement, is closely related to the stage of national development. The development of transportation and information transaction systems are particularly important among others, since they may reduce physical as well as social distance between regions, and thus facilitate direct movement from villages to large cities.

In fact, our data support the assumption. Table 3 shows the patterns of migration by year when migrants to Seoul left their birthplace. Before the 1960s stage migration was the predominant pattern. But after 1960 more migrants went to Seoul directly. Since 1960 the transportation and information network have been developed considerably and spread widely all over the country. Therefore, people can move more easily to anywhere in the country; they can also more easily obtain ample information about the destination city. Also as time goes on, more and more migrants living in Seoul have originated in the same origin place. Because this means that more personal ties have been formed between Seoul and the place of origin, migration to Seoul became much more easier than before through the utilization of information and substantial help from acquaintances who had previously migrated to Seoul.

Table 3. Year of Departure from Birth Place by Patterns of Move, Migrants to Seoul

Year	Direct	Stage	Total(Number)
Before 1950	23.1	76.9	100.0 (13)
1950-1959	45.9	54.1	100.0 (37)
1960-1969	81.3	18.8	100.0 (64)
After 1970	100.0	—	100.0 (15)
Total	67.4	32.6	100.0 (129)

Circular and Return Migration

The residential mobility histories of the respondents enable us to undertake a better assessment of the extent of return and circular movement. Although all the respondents of the current analysis are return migrants in the sense that they returned to their province of birth, use of smaller areal units of Shi, Myon or Eup for defining move will give another picture for the extent of return and circular movement. Here the return move refers to any movement to a Shi, Myon or Eup where a respondent lived before, and circular move denotes any back and forth movement between a particular place and others or between two places. Table 4 shows that 55.4 percent of the sample respondents lived in a different Shi, Myon or Eup during their lifetime. Thirty-three percent had an experience of living in a single place twice. This means that they have an experience of returning to a place where they once lived before. This includes those who were born in the sample town and returned there (17.5 percent of the total respondents). The remaining 11.6 percent of the respondents may be called circular migrants. Some of them (3.2 percent) even lived in the same place more than three times (i.e., A-B-A-C-A) and some others (8.4 percent) lived in at least two places two or more times (i.e., A-B-A-B). Most of the latter group are those who moved back and forth between rural origin and either Seoul or Daegu more than two times. This kind of circular migration occurs more frequently among those moving between rural area and Daegu than Seoul (10.1 percent *versus* 6.6 percent). It suggests that circulation may more likely occur over short distances. It should, however, be noted that the extent of circular and return migration for the general Korean population may be much less than that characterizing these respondents. This is because all these sample respondents were by definition return migrants, judged by the fact that they had returned to the rural area of their province of birth. It is to be expected that once one has experienced a return move, then the migrant is more likely to become circular migrant because he is more familiar with both the origin and destination areas.

Table 4. Extent of Circular and Return Movement

Move	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
Lived in all different Shi, Myon, Eup	44.5	65.5	55.4
Lived in one place twice	43.8	23.0	33.0
Lived in one place more than three times	5.1	1.4	3.2
Lived in two places two or more times	6.6	10.1	8.4
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	137	148	285

IV. PROCESS OF MOVE : INITIAL MOVE TO THE CITY AND RETURN MOVE

The process of return migration may differ from that of initial migration for at least two reasons. First of all, the destination of the return move is much more familiar to the migrant than the destination of the initial move. Therefore, return migration may involve less uncertainty and risk than the initial migration. Second, the return migrant has had at least one previous migration experience. This may enable the migrant to make a more rational decision and reduce possible risks that the migrant may otherwise encounter. This section deals with the migration process of initial movement to Seoul or Daegu and return movement to the current residence. Major emphasis is placed on how the migration process differs from one move to another, as well as between different cities of destination.

Type of Move

Whether migrants move alone or as part of a family may have a significant effect on other related processes. For migrants, moving alone may reduce pressures for adjusting to the new life in the destination. For example, lone migrants may find it much easier to secure a shelter for themselves than for their whole family. This is particularly true under the situation of severe housing shortages as exist in most cities in developing countries. If a migrant leaves his family at place of origin for a considerably longer time period, the migrant may be more inclined to return once even though he realizes that his expectation will not be fulfilled. If his family left behind in the origin has any income source, the migrant may have support from them during his unsettled period in the city, which will help to make the movement more successful. On the other hand, sometimes long separation may involve a transfer of part of the income earned by the migrant in the city to the origin for the support of his family. It has been documented that in some places remittances from outmigrants is significant for the village economy (Connell, 1976). A long separation of spouses may also have the effect of reducing fertility in the place of origin.

Table 5 classifies migrants to Seoul/Daegu by whether they moved alone or with part or all of their family. Concurrently, it controls for marital status. A large proportion of never-married migrants moved alone. Only one in five moved with part or all of their family. The individual single move is somewhat more prevalent for the migrant to Seoul than the migrant to Daegu. For married migrants, 36.6 percent of migrants to Seoul and 15.2 percent of migrants to Daegu moved alone, and another 7.3 percent and 9.1 percent of migrants to Seoul and Daegu respectively moved with part of the family.

In comparison with the initial move, the return move shows some differences (Table 6). For never-married respondents there are no moves with part of the family, indicating that return migrants are more prone to move individually. On the other hand, for married respondents, migrants to Seoul are more likely to return with their families compared to when they moved to Seoul. This may be explained by the fact that the place of return is much more familiar to them, and thus it is less difficult to bring the whole family. However, for married

Table 5. Type of Move (individual vs. family move) by Marital Status: Initial Move to the City

Type of move	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
	Never-married		
R alone	84.8	73.2	79.2
With part of family	4.2	11.0	7.3
With the whole family	11.5	15.9	13.5
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	96	82	178
	Married		
R alone	36.6	15.2	23.4
With part of family	7.3	9.1	8.4
With the whole family	56.1	75.8	68.2
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	41	66	107

Table 6. Type of Move (individual vs. family move) by Marital Status: Return Move

Type of Move	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
	Never-married		
R alone	86.1	80.0	84.3
With part of family	—	—	—
With the whole family	13.9	20.0	15.7
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	36	15	51
	Married		
R alone	25.7	23.7	24.6
With part of family	5.0	6.1	5.6
With the whole family	69.3	70.2	69.8
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	101	131	232

Table 7. Prior Experience of Residence in or Visit to Seoul/Daegu at the Time of Initial Move

Prior Experience	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
Lived in city previously	5.8	12.2	9.1
Visited city previously	43.1	52.0	47.7
None	50.4	35.8	42.8
NA	0.7	—	0.4
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	137	148	285

return migrants from Daegu, more respondents returned alone compared to their initial move to Daegu. Since Daegu is relatively so close to the current town of residence, there is probably no difference in difficulty to bring families between the initial and return move.

Regardless of marital status, the migrant to Seoul is more likely to move alone than the migrant to Daegu. Several factors may affect the decision to move alone or to move with the family. First of all, physical distance might influence this; longer distance involves more travel costs. Also the longer the distance, the less familiar the migrants may be with the area of des-

mination. In fact the data show that among migrants to Seoul 50.4 percent did not have any previous experience living in or visiting Seoul (see Table 7); by contrast, the corresponding figure for migrants to Daegu is only 35.8 percent.

Chain Migration

It is interesting to examine to what extent movement of one family member to the city is followed by subsequent moves by other family members. The phenomenon often called 'chain migration' refers to any subsequent moves in which other members of the immediate family, other relatives or even friends make the same move. But here only moves by immediate families are considered. Movement of wife and children joining husband and father is also included in chain migration here.

Table 8 shows that a considerable degree of subsequent migration occurs among family members. Among migrants to Seoul, 23.4 percent had families already living in Seoul at the time they moved. Another 22.6 percent had moves of other families after they moved into Seoul. Six percent of the migrants to Seoul both joined family members who had moved earlier to Seoul and also were later joined in Seoul by at least one additional family member. In comparison to migrants to Seoul, the occurrence of chain migration among migrants to Daegu was much less common. About 18 percent of respondents had families living in Daegu when they moved to Daegu, and 12.8 percent had families moved after they migrated to Daegu. Only 2.7 percent had families moving both before and after they moved. Altogether 46.0 and 30.4 percent of migrants to Seoul and Daegu respectively show the pattern of chain migration of family members. The observed difference in the extent of family chain migration between Seoul and Daegu seems to be attributable to the relative degree of difficulty to make moves to one destination over the other as well as the greater attraction of the national capital.

Table 8. Extent of Family Chain Migration: Initial Move to the City

Family Move	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
Family lived in destination at the time R moved	23.4	17.6	20.4
Family followed R	5.8	2.7	4.2
No family lived in destination at the time R moved	17.5	14.9	16.1
	76.6	81.1	78.9
Family followed R	22.6	12.8	17.5
No family followed R	54.0	68.2	61.4
NA	—	1.4	0.7
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	137	148	285

An important aspect of family chain migration is the length of time that elapsed between when one family member moved to the city and when the other family members joined or followed. Table 9 gives some insight into the length of time between moves. Due to the small number of cases, the table presents absolute numbers instead of percentages. For married migrants, the family (mostly wife and children) joined the migrant in a relatively short period of time, mostly within 2 years. In contrast, for never-married migrants much more time elapsed before any member (mostly brothers and sisters) of the family follow. This can be explained by the strength of ties between husband and wife and children which likely are much greater than that between siblings. Therefore, for married migrants their spouse and children are always ready to join the migrant whenever he can afford to bring them to the city. But for never-married

Table 9. Length of Time Between Respondents' and Other Family Members' Move to the City, by Marital Status

Length of Time	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
	Never-married		
Less than one year	6	6	2
1-2 years	6	3	9
2 years or more	12	9	21
NA	1	1	2
Total: Number	25	19	44
	Married		
Less than one year	7	4	11
1-2 years	3	1	4
2 years or more	3	1	4
NA	1	—	1
Total: Number	14	6	20

migrants, it is also likely that either or both the migrant him/her self and his brother or sister have to wait longer, for example, until they finish their school in the city or in the place of origin or until the migrant is more settled in the city.

The return move also involves some chain migration among respondents. Altogether 59 respondents have a family member who moved after the respondent returned to the current place (20.7 percent of the total respondents, table not shown). One interesting difference between initial and return move in respect to family chain migration is that in the return move, most families followed respondent within a very short period of time; about 73 percent did so within six months. In part this results from the fact that a return move involves migration to a familiar area. It is also probably due to the likelihood that maintaining families in the destination is much more difficult compared to when they remain behind in the place of rural origin, because the cost of living in the city is much higher and there may also be fewer social ties and kins in the urban destination.

Intention of Remigration

A fairly large proportion (68.4 percent) of migrants to the city reported that they had intended to live there permanently at the time they moved to Seoul/Daegu although in fact they returned later. Only 11.9 percent of migrants had intended to live in the city temporarily and 18.9 percent did not decide whether to live permanently or not (see Table 10).

Since they are actually return migrants, it is surprising that such a large number of respondents intended to live permanently in the city. Thus there is a possibility that some respondents altered their intention even though in fact they had intended to live permanently in the city at the time they moved. Two explanations are possible. They may have been failures in the city in the sense that they were not able to achieve their original goal and therefore had no alternative other than to return. Or some significant changes may have occurred during their stay in the city, such as new opportunities in their hometown or a nearby town; e.g., a newly established industrial complex on Gumi.

To those respondents who intended to live in the city temporarily, further questions were asked on how long they had planned to live there and where they planned to move (Table 11 and 12). As for the length of time, the answers are about equally split between a relatively short period (less than 5 years), and a fairly longer period (more than 10 years). Instead of the length of time, several respondents answered that they planned to remain until they finished learning skills or finished the education of their children or until they went to the army. Two

PATTERNS OF MIGRATION

Table 10. Intention of Remigration at the Time of Initial and Return Move

Intention	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
	Initial Move to the City		
To live permanently	73.0	64.2	68.4
To live temporarily	13.1	10.8	1.9
Not decided	13.9	23.6	18.9
NA	—	1.4	0.7
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	137	148	285
	Return Move		
To live permanently	46.7	50.7	48.8
To live temporarily	27.0	25.0	26.0
Not decided	25.5	24.3	24.9
NA	0.7	—	0.4
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	137	148	285

Table 11. Length of Time Intended to Reside in Place of Destination, Initial and Return Move

Length of Time	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
	Initial Move to the City		
Less than 5 years	6	6	12
6-9 years	1	2	3
More than 10 years	6	5	11
Other	3	1	4
NA	2	2	4
Total: Number	18	16	34
	Return move		
Less than a year	4	4	8
1-2 years	6	6	12
3-4 years	12	7	19
More than 5 years	2	1	3
Not decided	5	9	14
Other	5	1	6
NA	—	2	2
Total: Number	34	30	64

thirds of those who planned to remigrate aimed to return to their hometown.

The intention of remigration at the time they returned to the current place was asked, too. Interestingly a much smaller proportion replied that they intended to remain permanently in the current place, in comparison to the time they moved to the city. Table 10 shows that slightly less than a half of the respondents planned to reside permanently, and 26 percent wanted to move out again. Among those who intended to move out, about 80 percent wanted to move to Seoul/Daegu from where they had returned. Also they planned to make another move in a fairly short time period, mostly within 4 years. This indicates a strong preference for city living among return migrants, and also suggests that once a migrant becomes a return migrant, then the migrant is more likely to become a circular migrant, too.

Table 12. Intended Destination of Next Move, Initial and Return Move

Intended Destination	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
	Initial Move to the City		
Hometown	13	9	22
Other city	—	1	1
Other rural area	2	1	3
Not decided	3	5	8
Total: Number	18	16	34
	Return move		
Seoul/Daegu	28	22	50
Other rural area	2	1	3
Not decided	1	1	2
NA	3	6	9
Total: Number	34	30	64

Reasons for Move

Why do people move? This may be the key question for understanding the migration phenomenon, and especially return migration. However, reasons for a move are sometimes so complicated that one cannot account for them very easily. Often factors in both the origin and destination are equally important for making the decision to move; so-called push and pull operate concomitantly. Also respondents may not always find it easy to isolate the specific or even major reason for their move or choice of destination. Therefore, it is somewhat risky to explain migrants' behavior solely on the basis of stated reasons for move. This can only give a partial explanation.

Table 13 and 14 summarize the stated reasons for the move to the city and for the return. Are there any differences between reasons for initial move to the city and those for return to the province of birth? In both moves, job related reasons are the most dominant. In both initial and return moves, about half migrated to seek take or transfer and for business. About one-third of job related moves in return migration were transfers. But most striking is the minimal difference in importance of job related reasons for both initial and return moves and between those moving to and those moving from Seoul and Daegu.

The second major reason for move to the city is education. Nearly a quarter of migrants moved to Seoul/Daegu for education. This category includes several cases of education for children, but most were the education for the respondents themselves. The move for educa-

Table 13. Reasons for Move to the City

Reason	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
Job related	54.7	51.4	53.0
Education	24.8	20.9	22.8
For better living	6.6	8.1	7.4
Dissatisfaction with the origin place	1.5	6.8	4.2
Personal tie	2.9	1.4	2.1
Following head	2.2	4.7	3.5
No specific reason	4.4	0.7	2.5
Other	1.5	3.4	2.5
NA	1.5	2.7	2.1
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	137	148	285

PATTERNS OF MIGRATION

Table 14. Reasons for Return Move from the City

Reason	Return from:		Total
	Seoul	Daegu	
Job related	49.6	52.0	50.9
For better living	11.7	25.7	18.9
Dissatisfaction with the city	8.0	4.7	6.3
Personal tie	17.5	9.5	13.3
Military service	5.1	—	2.5
Following head	0.7	2.0	1.4
Other	4.4	4.1	4.2
NA	2.9	2.0	2.5
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	137	148	285

tional purpose is exceptionally high here when compared to other studies. For example, Green (1977) found in her study of migration in Seoul in 1974 that 14.6 percent of male respondents migrated to Seoul for education. This difference is partially attributable to the age of migrants at the time of the move to Seoul. In our survey younger age groups are overrepresented. The difference can also be explained by the fact that those who moved to city for education are more likely to return after they finish their desired education, and therefore are more numerous in this sample. As one would expect, no migrants cited education itself as the reason for the return move.

For the return moves, the desire for better living is the second major reason. As expected, a large proportion of respondents (13.3 percent) returned to the current place because they have families, relatives and friends and because of ties to their hometown. Military service was also cited by several respondents as the reason for return.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Utilizing residential mobility history of return migrants, this analysis has examined some patterns and processes characterizing total moves during lifetime period, and the initial move to the city and the return move. The analysis disclosed that the total mobility of the return migrants was low in spite of the fact that relatively small spatial units and a short time period have been used for defining a move, and that all the respondents were return migrants. It showed that total mobility was affected by the physical distance between place of origin and destination. Direct rural to urban movement appeared to be the prevalent pattern among return migrants. However, some migrants experienced a type of stage migration. Stage migration was found more among migrants to Seoul than among migrants to Daegu. Physical distance between origin and final destination, and the level of societal development were found important in accounting for stage migration. On the average, one of ten return migrants experienced circulation. However, the extent of circulation for the general population is expected to be less than that observed in the analysis because all respondents were, by intention, return migrants; once one has experienced a return move, the migrant is more likely to be a circular migrant.

As expected, the analysis revealed some differences in the process of movement between the initial move to the city and the return move, and also between the moves to and from the remote capital city of Seoul and nearby the provincial capital of Daegu. The results showed that moves to longer distances involved more individual migrants and more chain migration as compared to short distance moves. A strong preference for living in the city was found among respondents. A significantly large proportion of the respondents had intended to reside

permanently in the city although in fact they returned later. In contrast, fewer planned to reside in the current place permanently. Among those who wanted to move out, a majority intended to move again to the city from where they had returned within a fairly short time period.

Besides greater job opportunities in the city, the better education facilities of the city also attracted the migrants. Nearly a quarter of respondents moved to the city for education. This suggests that creating job opportunities in rural areas is not sufficient for inducing and retaining the population. Although they returned to rural area for their own job, the return migrants may become more concerned about education for their children as the children are growing up. If they believe that only the large city can provide better education to their children, a large proportion of them would move to city again. It is more likely that this will happen to those who attained some higher education in the city and who have higher socioeconomic status, and thus can afford to have their children obtain higher education. This suggests that the discrepancy between rural and urban areas may become even larger. Therefore, it points to the need for government policies designed to reduce discrepancies in education facilities between urban and rural areas and among regions.

The current analysis was based on only those return migrants who were born in Gyeong-sangbugdo province and moved to and returned from two cities; Seoul and Daegu. Although the issues dealt with in the analysis provide important and interesting insights on levels and patterns of return movement and circulation, it must be stressed that the findings cannot be generalized to the total population. Therefore, further research is needed to provide a broader basis for generalization of the patterns and processes observed in this analysis.

References

- Connell, John, *et al.*
 1976 *Migration from Rural Area*, Delhi, India: Oxford University Press
- DaVanzo, Julie
 1976 'Differences between return and nonreturn migrants: An econometric analysis,' *International Migration Review*, 10:1 (Spring), pp. 13-27
-
- 1978 'New, repeat, and return migration: Comment,' *Southern Economic Journal*, (Oct.), pp. 680-684
- Eldridge, Hope
 1965 'Primary, secondary, and return migration in the United States, 1955-60,' *Demography*, 2, pp. 444-455
- Goldscheider, Calvin
 1971 'An outline of the migration system,' *Proceedings of the International Population Conference*, London, 1969, Liege:IUSSP, pp. 2746-2754
- Goldstein, Sidney
 1954 'Repeated migration as a factor in high mobility rates,' *American Sociological Review*, 1955, pp. 536-541
-
- 1964 'The extent of repeated migration: An analysis based on the Danish population register,' *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 59, pp. 1121-1132
-
- 1978 *Circulation in the Context of Total Mobility in Southeast Asia*, Papers of the East-West Population Institute, No. 53, Honolulu, Hawaii: East-West Population Institute
- Green, Sarah Clark
 1977 *Dimensions of Migrant Adjustment in Seoul, Korea*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Brown University
- Hugo, Graeme
 1975 *Population Mobility in West Java*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Research School of Social Science,

Australian National University, Canberra

Kau, James and C.F. Sirmans

- 1976 'New, repeat, and return migration: A study of migrants types,' *Southern Economic Journal*, (Oct.), pp. 1144-1148

-
- 1978 'New, repeat, and return migration: Reply,' *Southern Economic Journal*, (Jan.), pp. 680-684

Kiker, B.F. and Earle C. Traynham, Jr.

- 1976 'A comment on research on internal migration in the United States: A survey,' *Journal of Economic Literature*, 14:3 (Sept.), pp. 985-988

Miller, Ann R.

- 1977 'Interstate migrants in the United States: Some socio-economic differences by type of move,' *Demography*, 14:1 (Feb.), pp. 1-17

Miller, Edward

- 1973 'Return and nonreturn in-migration,' *Growth and Change*, 4:1 (Jan.), pp. 3-9

Simmons, Alan, *et. al.*

- 1977 *Social Change and Internal Migration*, Ottawa, Canada, International Development Research Center

Vanderkamp, John

- 1971 'Migration flows, their determinants and the effects of return migration,' *Journal of Political Economy*, (Sept.), pp. 1012-1031

-
- 1972 'Return migration: Its significance and behavior,' *Western Economic Journal*, (Dec.), pp. 460-465

〈國文要約〉

이주 유형 : 한국에서의 도시—농촌간 귀환이동 분석 결과

崔 鎭 昊
權 泰 煥

이 논문은 한국의 경상도 지방에 있는 3개읍에서 실시한 표본조사 자료에 바탕을 두고 응답자의 거주 지역 이동 경력을 이용하여 일반적인 이주 과정과 관련된 몇 가지 쟁점을 검토해 보고 있다.

분석결과 전체 귀환이동은 낮은 편이며, 전체 이동은 원거주지와 이주예정지와의 물리적 거리에 영향을 받는다는 사실이 나타났다.

직접 농촌에서 도시로 이동하는 것이 귀환이동중에 가장 일반적인 유형이지만 단계적인 이동을 하는 이주민들도 있었다. 단계적이동을 설명하는데는 원 거주지와 최종 이주지간의 물리적 거리 및 사회구조적 발전수준이 중요시된다.

평균적으로 귀환이동자 10명 가운데 한명이 순환이동을 경험하고 있다. 분석 결과로 나타난 또 하나의 사실은 최초 도시로의 이동과 귀환이동간에 이동 과정상의 차이가 나타나며, 또한 원격지인 서울로 이주하는 것과 근처 도청소재지인 대구로 이동하는 것 사이에도 차이가 나타난다는 점이다. 나중에 귀환은 하였지만 도시에 살 결심으로 이주했던 응답자들에게서는 강한 도시거주선호성이 나타나고 있다.

보다 넓은 취업기회 이외에 보다 나은 교육시설의 혜택이 도시로의 이주에 중요한 요인임이 조사결과에서 밝혀지고 있다.

이 사실로 우리는 단순히 농촌에 취업기회를 마련해 준다는 것이 농촌 인구유입이나 유지에 충분한 조건이 될 수 없다는 것을 알 수 있다.

