VOLUME AND CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERNAL MIGRATION IN COLOMBIA

I.   Introduction

That a high degree of population mobility characterizes demographic phenomena in most Latin American countries has become a routine statement.   That such movements exercise a widespread influence on the economic, political and demographic structures of both receiving and sending areas is similarly commonplace.   Paradoxically, however, the exact dimensions of these movements in recent periods are still largely unknown in many countries; moreover, investigation of the manner of their impact on the various aforementioned structures tends strongly towards the speculative.   It can be contended that the fundamental reason for this state of affairs rests on the absence of reliable data on migration and its consequences in recent years.

At present, researchers and planners alike are wont to fall back on dated census information or else are forced to rely on updated local area surveys, thereby lending a fragmentary character to migration investigations.   Moreover, the census information on migration has usually been of an indirect nature and not until the 1960 round of censuses were direct questions on migratory status incorporated into various questionnaires.   These data remain, for the most part, unpublished or else have only been superficially exploited in the regular census tabulations.

One approach to a possible bridging of this data gap would be through utilization of migration information available in CELADE's "Operación Muestras de Censos (OMUECE).[1]

These data, culled from the various population censuses carried out circa 1960, command considerable potential value in several respects.   Not only can they provide advance information unavailable elsewhere, but, more importantly, they have been ordained in such a manner as to present several valuable tabulations, particularly in connection with the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of migrants, which do not generally appear in regular census publications.   The fact that the format of OMUECE tabulations has been standardized for several countries further enhances their potential fruitfulness since they can, theoretically at least, be utilized comparatively in the formulation of an eventual overview of migration, its characteristics and consequences in several Latin American countries.

---

[1]   Cf. CELADE, Banco de Datos - Boletín Informativo, Nos. 3 and 4.   Thanks are extended to CELADE for permission to use and copy OMUECE tabulations.

6433

M 71-1-98

As a first step towards such a possible overview, the purpose of this preliminary paper is to analyze the volume, differentials and consequences of internal migration in one country, utilizing the OMUECE sample data. For practical considerations of timing, availability, data reliability and significance, the country chosen for this initial study is Colombia.[2]

The present investigation can thus be construed as fulfilling a two-fold purpose. Firstly, it will provide relatively recent information on migration patterns in at least one country; in light of its size, its relatively well-developed urban netwrok, and its high rate of population mobility, the study of migrations in Colombia should prove to be of inherent individual value. Simultaneously, the fruitfulness of working with OMUECE data will be evaluated with a view to a possible extension of this type of analysis to other countries for which similar migration data will soon become available.

In substantive terms, the following presentation deals with two principal aspects of internal migration in Colombia.

The first part describes the amount and direction of migratory movements during recent years while the second delves into the selective characteristics of migrants, focusing particular attention on the relative economic adaptability of migrants to their areas of destination.

II. Volume of Internal Migrations in Colombia

As a preliminary to the study of migration flow in Colombia, the meaning and implications of certain key concepts should be clarified. Generally, the term "migration" refers to the movement of individuals from one identifiable locality to another, often with some connotation of permanence in the move, such as in a change of residence. In a simple but widely-accepted definition - "movement which involves a change in the usual place of residence from one community to another is classed as migration".[3] The practical application of this definition to studies of population movement within a country, however, requires the operational definition

---

[2] The size of the sample selected by OMUECE evidently varies with each country; in Colombia, a 2 per cent sample was selected from the 1964 census, yielding a total of some 350,000 cases. (See Boletín Informativo, No. 4 (ibid) for details on selection of sample.) Initial comparisons carried out in the process of this investigation, suggest high reliability of the OMUECE with reference to census data.

[3] C.H. Hamilton - "Some problems of method in internal migration research", Population Index, 27 (299), Oct. 1961. Cf. also Jorge Arévalo - "La definición de migración", Conferencia Regional de Población, Sesión 3, México 1970.

of time and space referents, that is, the localities and time periods within which migratory movements occur. Actually, the researcher generally has little choice but to accept the criteria established in the census data or other utilized sources of information, even though the time-space referents such as defined therein may be somewhat less than ideal.

In the Colombian census, and thus in the CMUECE tabulations being utilized here, respondents were enumerated on a de jure basis of residence. Two sets of administrative boundaries are distinguished across which a change of residence is to be defined as migration and consequently two overlapping definitions of internal migration are provided. A migrant, in the first instance, can be construed as a person having crossed only a municipio boundary in the process of changing his usual place of residence and thus be counted as an inter-DAI (División Administrativa Intermedia) migrant. Secondly, he may have crossed a departamento boundary in changing residence and hence be counted as an inter-DAM (División Administrativa Mayor) migrant.

The distinction between inter-DAI and inter-DAM migrants has several implications which should be spelled out. Firstly, a person who changed his usual place of residence to any other location within the same municipality would not be considered as a migrant in the present context. Secondly, since inter-DAM migrants automatically cross a DAI boundary in the process of migrating, then for some purposes, both categories can be grouped into a more encompassing 'migrant' category. Lastly, assuming that, as is logical, inter-DAM migrants travel, on the average, longer distances than inter-DAI movers, we will have occasion in the course of this presentation to distinguish between long and short-distance migrants.

With respect to volume of migration, the CMUECE tabulations provide two distinct types of information - place of birth and place of previous residence - both of which are cross-classified by type of move (inter-DAI or inter-DAM). The first set provides data on residual lifetime migration, that is, on the number of persons who, at the census date, were found residing in an administrative area other than that of their birth. The second, cross-classified by time of migration, relates to the number of persons who previously lived in an administrative area other than that of their present residence (regardless of birthplace).

Finally, to conclude these methodological remarks, it should be noted that the present CMUECE tabulations distinguish between migrants to three broad destination areas. The first receiving area is constituted by the capital city,

Bogotá, which contains 9 per cent of Colombia's total population. The second includes "all other urban areas" (i.e. excluding the capital);[4] these contain 43 per cent of the country's population. The third includes all rural areas which account for the remaining 48 per cent of Colombia's inhabitants. Evidently, since neither the place of birth nor duration of residence data in the present source are tabulated by origin of move, no information can be presented here on stream (e.g. rural to urban) movements.

Turning now to the substantive analysis of migration volume, Table 1 shows that, according to the aforementioned place of birth statistics, better than one-third of all native Colombians were living in an administrative area other than that of their birth as of 1964. Most noteworthy in Table 1 is the fact that more than half of Bogota's population is constituted by such lifetime migrants. But, in addition, it is significant that more than two-fifths of the remaining urban population and one-quarter of the rural population were also migrants. The overall picture presented in table 1 is thus that of a highly mobile population; inflating the OMUECE sample data to the total population would indicate that some $6\frac{1}{2}$ of Colombia's $17\frac{1}{2}$ million inhabitants in 1964 had changed their usual place of residence across their native administrative boundaries at some time prior to the census date. Of these $6\frac{1}{2}$ million migrants, approximately thirteen per cent moved to Bogotá, fifty-one per cent to other urban areas and the remainder to rural areas.[5]

The prevailing directions of migratory movements in Colombia as shown in table 1 is thus rather surprising; for years now, social scientists have been affirming that the preferential direction of migratory moves in Latin America is towards large urban areas and especially towards the capital. Yet, upon examining national data (a rarely-utilized approach) one finds that relatively

---

[4] In the 1964 Colombian census "urban" is defined in politico-administrative terms, i.e., the head of the municipal authority, regardless of size. República de Colombia, DANE - XII Censo Nacional de Población, 15 de julio, 1964. Resumen General.

[5] Unfortunately, due to the nature of the OMUECE data, it is practically impossible to establish direct comparisons between the results of this investigation and those of other migration studies in Colombia. This caveat is applicable to both the information on volume and on differentials of migration. For different recent approaches to the study of migration in Colombia, cf. Ramiro Cardona (ed.) Migración y Desarrollo Urbano, Asociación Colombiana de Facultades de Medicina, División de Estudios de Población, 1970. Alan Simmons y Ramiro Cardona - "La selectividad de la migración en una perspectiva histórica: el caso de Bogotá, 1929-1968", Conferencia Regional Latinoamericana de Población, Session 3, Mexico 1970. Dale Adams - "Rural migration and agricultural development in Colombia", Economic Development and Cultural Change, Vol. 17, July 1909, p. 524-540.

few migrants head towards Colombia's capital; more than half go towards lesser
cities as well as to towns and villages. But, in an era where Latin American
migrations are readily equated with rural to urban movements, it is perhaps even
more surprising that a full 36 per cent of all moves are towards rural areas.

Table 1

INTER-MUNICIPALITY AND INTER-DEPARTMENT MIGRANTS AS A PERCENTAGE
OF THE TOTAL RESIDENT POPULATION IN BOGOTA, OTHER URBAN
AREAS, RURAL AREAS AND COUNTRY (COLOMBIA, 1964)

Type of migrant	Capital	Other urban areas	Rural areas	Country
Inter-Municipality	0.5%	24.0%	16.0%	18.0%
Inter-Department	50.6	19.3	11.0	18.1
All migrants	51.1	43.3	27.0	36.1

Source: OMUECE, table 18.

Closer scrutiny of these migrations does reveal that a majority of the
migrants to rural areas only cross a municipio boundary instead of a departamento
boundary in the process of arriving at their present destination. Hence, it may
be inferred that a substantial proportion of rural-wards migrants are short
distance movers. Possibly, this migratory current includes a few seasonal
migrants but these would be scanty in light of Colombia's de jure definition
of migrant. Several arguments could be adduced to explain the magnitude of
rural-wards movements in that country - la violencia, rapid population growth,
changes in agricultural practices, shifting primary activities - but none of
these can be tested with present data. In any case, the magnitude of the movements
to rural areas commands considerable interest and the fact that same 2½ million
people are rural-wards migrants is a datum of some significance.

As was to be expected on the basis of the geographical-administrative demarcation of Bogotá (i.e., the capital is a distinct entity and to move into Bogotá from anywhere almost necessarily implies crossing a departmental boundary), practically all of its migrants were born in other departamentos. By contrast, the majority of migrants to other urban areas (as were migrants to rural areas) were born in other municipios within the same departamento. That is, in Colombia, migrants to urban areas (with the exception of Bogotá) and to rural areas predominantly select relatively nearby municipios within their native departamentos as their destination.

A second estimate of migration available in the OMUECE data was obtained from the tabulation of responses to the question - "what was the date you moved into this community?" Again these data refer only to surviving lifetime migrants but they have the advantage of identifying major migration periods. According to this measure, as shown in table 2, the greater proportion of all surviving migrants present in Colombia's capital, other urban areas and rural areas arrived less than five years prior to the census date of 1964. Thirty-nine per cent of all surviving migrants to Bogotá, and a similar proportion of those to all other urban areas arrived between 1959-64; likewise, some 34 per cent of migrants to rural areas arrived in the same period.

The apparent recency of migration shown here, however, has to be regarded cautiously since closer scrutiny of the duration of residence tables uncovers systematic errors in the computations of data by age which in turn might, and do in fact, affect totals on period of arrival.[6] In this light, further interpretation of the duration of residence data would be superfluous. We thus turn our attention directly to the study of migration differentials.

III. Migration Differentials and their Consequences

Concern with migration differentials has ever been central to the demographic interest in migration. This preoccupation with differentials stems from the fact that the effects of migration, whether for sending areas,

_____

[6] When data on duration of residence were analyzed in terms of age composition, the credibility of this information became questionable. Essentially, it was found that in the group of migrants having a duration of residence of 0-4 years at their destination, the 0-4 year age group of these migrants was found to be inflated beyond all logical or explainable proportion. Similarly, it was discovered that the 5-9 year groups were inflated among migrants having arrived 5-9 years ago and a similar disproportion of 10-14 migrants was uncovered in the category with ten or more years of residence. This, of course, denotes a systematic coding or tabulation error at some stage of the computation process. For this purpose, and to eliminate most of the error, all subsequent comparisons between migrants and non-migrants will be carried out on the cohorts aged ten years or more.

Table 2

DURATION OF RESIDENCE OF MIGRANTS AT THEIR DESTINATION, BY TYPE
OF MIGRATION AND BY DESTINATION

(in percentages)

Type of migration and duration of residence (in years)		Bogotá	Other urban areas	Rural areas
			DESTINATION	
Inter-Municipality	0-1	8.5	16.6	19.3
	1-4	23.1	27.6	29.1
	5-9	16.2	18.0	17.3
	10 +	23.8	20.9	17.1
	N.D.	28.5	16.9	17.2
Inter-Department	0.1	12.6	12.9	9.3
	1.4	26.7	24.5	22.1
	5-9	19.7	19.2	19.0
	10 +	24.4	22.4	21.4
	N.D.	16.7	21.0	28.2
All migrants	0.1	12.6	13.6	10.7
	1.4	26.7	25.2	23.1
	5.9	19.5	18.9	18.7
	10 +	24.4	22.1	20.8
	N.D.	16.8	20.2	26.6

Source: CMUECE, table 19.

for receiving areas, or for the migrants themselves, are in large part a function of the composition of the migrant population. Essentially, discussion as to the function or disfunctions performed by migration for a given receiving area hinges upon the ability of migrants to establish themselves productively in their new environment. Indeed, these characteristics determine whether or not migration results in a rational re-distribution of productive manpower in a matrix of unequal national opportunities or, in the clustering of parasitic elements in an already cluttered socio-economic or employment structure.

Despite their importance, however, the lack of satisfactory information directly relating characteristics of migrants to those of the non-migrant population at destination is a common complaint and has led to conflicting statements as to the role of migrants.[7] The CMUECE tabulations for Colombia provide an opportunity to delve into the characteristics of migrants at considerably greater length than is customary in nation-wide studies. More specifically, the following discussion will gravitate on two main axes:

a) demographic characteristics of migrants: age-sex composition and marital status.

b) characteristics determining the economic adaptation of migrants: literacy and education, labour force participation, occupational category, branch of economic activity, economically-marginal activities.
The elaboration of migration differentials in each of these areas should progressively provide the elements for an overview of the positive or negative repercussions of migration for the various receiving areas; these elements will be drawn together in the concluding paragraphs of this section.

1. Social and demographic characteristics

a) Age composition of the migrant population

Although the search for universal migration differentials has been relatively fruitless, one variable - the age of migrants - has demonstrated considerable regularity throughout the world. It would appear that in Latin America, as

---

[7] Popularly, migrants are held to predominate at the lower rungs of the socio-economic ladder and native migrant differences in this direction are assumed to be pronounced. Several recent reviews of migration differentials caution us that few generalizations can as yet be made on the subject. See, for instance, Juan Elizaga, "Migraciones interiores: evolución reciente y estado actual de los estudios", Conferencia Regional Latinoamericana de Población, Mexico 1970, sesión 3, pp. 12-13, and, John Macisco, "Some thoughts on an analytic framework for rural to urban migration", ibid, pp.7-8. See also Jorge Balan, "Migrant-native socioeconomic differences in Latin American cities: a structural analysis", Latin American Research Review, 4 (1): 3-29.

elsewhere, young adults predominate in the migrant population, particularly as concerns migratory currents towards urban areas of attraction.

For instance, in a sample survey of six Brazilian cities, it was found that 66.5 per cent of all migrants to these cities were between the ages of 15-39 at the time of their arrival.[8] Similarly, in San Salvador, a 1960 sample survey indicated that 64% of all migrants to that city were between the ages of 15-44 at the time of the survey.[9] In Metropolitan Lima, a 1966 survey revealed that 56.5% of all migrants to the area were between the ages of 15-39 at the time of the survey.[10] In Greater Santiago, among recent migrants (i.e., those with fewer than ten years of residence), 83.1 per cent were between the ages of 15-44; more than six out of ten of these recent migrants arrived before their twenty-sixth birthday.[11]

The composition of migration streams to rural areas has received very little attention but, faced with such repetitive evidence, it would be extremely surprising to find anything but a predominance of young migrants in Colombia. Actually, as shown in table 3, a rather large proportion of all recent migrants (i.e., those with less than five years of residence at destination) in Colombia are less than thirty years old. Of the recent male migrants aged 10 and over [12] residing in Bogotá as of 1964, 38 per cent were in the age group 20-29 and 69 per cent in the group 10-29. By comparison, 23 per cent of the corresponding group

---

[8]   Bertram Hutchinson, "The migrant population of urban Brazil", América Latina, 6 (2): 41-71, April-June 1963.

[9]   United Nations, ECLA - Aspectos Demográficos y Socioeconómicos del Area Metropolitana de San Salvador, E/CN.12/CCE/333, pp. 57-58.

[10]   Perú, Dirección Nacional de Estadística - Encuesta en Lima Metropolitana, Lima, Perú, 1966, p. 25.

[11]   Bruce Herrick - Urban Migration and Economic Development in Chile, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass., 1964, pp. 73-76. Juan Elizaga - Migraciones a las áreas metropolitanas de América Latina, CELADE, 1970.

[12]   Problems in the data referring to the under 10 age group (cf. footnote 6 above) forced limitation of the comparisons between recent migrants and all other residents to the population aged 10 years and over.

Table 3

COMPARATIVE AGE COMPOSITION OF RECENT MIGRANT AND RESIDENT POPULATIONS,
BY SEX AND DESTINATION

(in percentages)

Age and Sex		Bogotá		Other Urban Areas		Rural Areas	
		Recent migrants	Residents	Recent migrants	Residents	Recent migrants	Residents
M	10-19	30.9	31.9	33.8	36.7	32.2	35.8
	20-29	38.4	22.9	29.2	19.4	28.9	19.5
A	30-39	16.7	20.1	17.8	16.2	18.9	16.1
L	40-49	6.8	12.5	9.1	11.8	10.5	12.2
E	50-59	4.3	7.4	5.3	8.1	5.2	8.3
	60 +	2.9	5.1	4.7	7.9	4.3	8.1
F	10-19	39.6	29.8	39.9	33.4	34.9	34.3
E	20-29	31.9	24.8	28.1	21.1	29.0	21.4
M	30-39	13.0	19.3	14.0	17.0	17.9	17.3
A	40-49	6.0	11.9	7.9	11.7	9.0	11.6
L	50-59	4.6	7.6	4.8	7.7	4.9	7.4
E	60 +	4.9	6.6	5.2	9.1	4.3	8.0

Source: CMUECE, table 20.

of Bogotá's population was aged 20-29 and 54 per cent were 10-29. [13]

The predominance of these same age groups is still substantial in male migration streams to all other urban areas although not as accentuated as in the case of Bogotá; all told, 63 per cent of the 10 and over recent migrants to these urban areas were aged 10-29, the majority of these being aged 10-19. In contrast, the remainder of the urban population, composed of earlier migrants and natives, had only 56 per cent of its 10 and over population aged 20-29. Male migration streams to rural areas were still predominantly young but the contrast of the recent migrants' age structure with that of the remaining rural population was not as great; this lack of differentiation would appear to be the result of high fertility rates prevailing in rural areas and to the consequent young population pyramids of the resident group in these areas.

The ascendency of youthful migrants is heightened in the case of females. Indeed, a remarkably high 72 per cent of recent female migrants to Bogotá, 68 per cent of those to other urban areas and 64 per cent of those to rural areas were aged 10-29. By contrast, the residents (natives and other non-recent migrants), [14] in Bogotá, other urban areas and rural areas had approximately 55 per cent in the corresponding age group.

In short, as was to be expected on the basis of previous investigations into migration differentials, migrants to all areas of Colombia are highly selective of the younger age groups, particularly of the 10-29 category. Supposing that, as is plausible, previous migrants have been drawn largely from the same age groups as recent migrants in 1964, what would be the cumulative effect of this pattern on the demographic structures of receiving areas?

Interestingly enough, the cross-sectional examination of the age-sex composition of natives, migrants and immigrants in tables 4 to 6 does not immediately betray this preponderant youthfulness of migrants. **Indeed the numerical superiority of migrants only** becomes evident in the cohorts over age twenty and it tends to increase with advancing age.

---

[13] Percentage comparisons between migrants and residents are used extensively throughout the remainder of this presentation and it may be well to explain the computational procedures utilized therein. CMUECE furnishes two series of tables: one refers to the total population of the capital, urban areas, rural areas, the other gives the same information for recent migrants to each of these areas. In order to obtain a meaningful comparison between recent migrants and all other residents, each sub-group of recent migrants has to be subtracted from the corresponding sub-group in the appropriate total population table.

[14] For purposes of convenience in phrasing, the group formed by natives plus all other earlier migrants to each of the destination areas will hereafter be referred to simply as "residents".

Table 4

CONTRIBUTION OF NATIVES, INTER-DAI MIGRANTS, INTER-DAM MIGRANTS AND
IMMIGRANTS TO THE COMPOSITION OF EACH AGE-SEX COHORT OF
BOGOTA'S POPULATION

(in percentages)

Age and Sex	Natives	Inter-DAI Migrants	Inter-DAM Migrants	Immigrants	Total
0-9	83.9	0.3	15.3	0.6	100.0
10-19	56.7	0.4	42.4	0.5	100.0
M 20-29	28.3	0.5	70.2	1.0	100.0
A 30-39	23.3	0.7	73.1	2.9	100.0
L 40-49	20.4	1.1	76.4	2.1	100.0
E 50-59	15.8	1.1	78.8	4.3	100.0
60 ⊕	18.2	2.0	75.1	4.7	100.0
Total	50.5	0.6	47.6	1.3	100.0
0-9	83.4	0.3	15.8	0.5	100.0
F 10-19	48.4	0.4	50.5	0.7	100.0
E 20-29	25.5	0.4	73.1	1.1	100.0
M 30-39	21.5	0.7	76.3	1.6	100.0
A 40-49	19.4	0.6	77.9	2.1	100.0
L 50-59	16.3	0.7	80.6	2.3	100.0
E 60 ⊕	15.2	1.3	81.7	1.7	100.0
Total	45.3	0.5	53.1	1.1	100.0

Source: CMUECE, table 18.

Table 5

CONTRIBUTION OF NATIVES, INTER-DAI MIGRANTS, INTER-DAM MIGRANTS AND
IMMIGRANTS TO THE COMPOSITION OF EACH AGE-SEX COHORT OF
COLOMBIA'S URBAN POPULATION (EXCEPTING BOGOTA)

(in percentages)

	Age and Sex	Natives	Inter-DAI Migrants	Inter-DAM Migrants	Immigrants	Total
	0-9	79.5	11.7	8.5	0.3	100.0
	10-19	61.1	21.8	16.6	0.4	100.0
M	20-29	41.8	29.3	28.3	0.5	100.0
A	30-39	35.6	31.2	32.0	1.2	100.0
L	40-49	34.9	33.2	30.8	1.0	100.0
E	50-59	33.2	34.3	31.2	1.3	100.0
	60 ⊽	35.6	35.4	27.4	1.7	100.0
	Total	57.5	22.5	19.4	0.6	100.0
	0-9	78.8	11.9	9.1	0.2	100.0
F	10-19	57.0	25.4	17.3	0.3	100.0
E	20-29	40.2	32.5	26.7	0.6	100.0
M	30-39	37.4	33.8	28.0	0.7	100.0
A	40-49	35.6	36.1	27.4	1.0	100.0
L	50-59	36.6	35.3	27.4	0.7	100.0
E	60 ⊕	39.2	35.9	24.1	0.9	100.0
	Total	55.0	25.3	19.2	0.5	100.0

Source: OMUECE, table 18.

Table 6

CONTRIBUTION OF NATIVES, INTER-DAI MIGRANTS, INTER-DAM MIGRANTS AND
IMMIGRANTS TO THE COMPOSITION OF EACH AGE-SEX COHORT OF
COLOMBIA'S RURAL POPULATION

(in percentages)

	Age and Sex	Natives	Inter-DAI Migrants	Inter-DAM Migrants	Immigrants	Total
	0-9	84.8	9.6	5.5	0.1	100.0
	10-19	74.1	15.5	10.3	0.1	100.0
M	20-29	60.9	20.7	18.2	0.2	100.0
A	30-39	58.0	22.5	19.3	0.2	100.0
L	40-49	56.8	23.1	19.9	0.2	100.0
E	50-59	56.4	23.7	19.6	0.3	100.0
	60 ⊕	57.7	25.1	16.8	0.4	100.0
	Total	71.3	16.4	12.2	0.1	100.0
	0-9	84.9	9.7	5.4	0.1	100.0
F	10-19	76.6	14.5	8.8	0.1	100.0
E	20-29	66.6	19.8	13.4	0.2	100.0
M	30-39	63.1	21.9	14.9	0.2	100.0
A	40-49	63.8	21.4	14.6	0.2	100.0
L	50-59	63.8	22.5	13.6	0.1	100.0
E	60 ⊕	65.3	22.0	12.4	0.2	100.0
	Total	74.6	15.5	9.7	0.1	100.0

Source: OMUECE, table 18.

The explanation, of course, derives from the fact that the age-sex distribution of the native population is affected by births, deaths and migration, whereas that of migrants is affected only by deaths and migration. Hence the native population of Bogotá, other urban areas and rural areas is increased by births to natives and non-natives as well, and consequently its population composition displays a wide base which is depleted at each succeeding cohort by the normal progression of mortality (and to a negligible extent by out-migration). By contrast, each level of the migrant population structure is continually being added to by net migration. Thus, for instance, the 30-39 migrants in 1964 is constituted by all survivors of the 30-39 migrants in the period 1954-1964, plus the survivors of 20-29 migrants in 1944-54 and so forth. Hence, while the age-sex pyramid of natives is approximately symmetrical, that of lifetime surviving migrants shows a bulge in the central age groups as a result of continued infiltration in these groups.

In light of these basic considerations, it can easily be understood that the cross-sectional examination of population composition does not immediately demonstrate the youthfulness of incoming migrants.

Aside from this methodological remark, the main observation which can be derived from the examination of tables 4-6 and Figure 1 relates to the large proportion of both the male and female population of Bogotá, other urban areas and rural areas which is constituted by migrants. Although this statement holds weight for all cohorts, in Bogotá, these proportions are particularly impressive in the age groups over thirty since 70 to 80 per cent of the total population of each of these cohorts is constituted by migrants. In other urban areas, migrants made up some 60 per cent of all age-sex groups were over thirty and in rural areas, the corresponding proportion varies between 25 and 30 per cent.

b)   Composition of Migration Currents by Sex

The patterns of migration by sex are perhaps less striking than those by age but available sources would seem to indicate a preponderance of female migrants in most Latin American migration streams, particularly among short-distance and urban-ward migrants. Elizaga, reviewing the annual rates of migration by sex to major Latin American nuclei between 1938 and 1963, concludes that female migration is more intense than male migration.[15] Similar results

_____

15/   Juan Elizaga, "Internal migrations in Latin America", Milbank Memorial Fund Quaterly, 43 (3-4) pp. 149-150.

have been obtained in the aforementioned surveys of migration to six Brazilian cities, to Lima, to San Salvador and to Santiago.[16] Further corroboration stems from the fact that the urban sex ratio is lower than the national in every Latin American country except Peru, apparently as a result of predominantly female rural-urban migration which is characteristic of the region.[17]

Yet, in a study of inter-departamental migration in Guatemala, Arias found that migration was generally higher among males; only six out of twenty-two departments showed higher figures for females, and of these, only Guatemala showed a net gain.[18] Moreover, Elizaga finds that in Venezuela, the data reveal a remarkable uniformity of both sexes in the interstate as well as intra-state migration.[19] In Mexico, Burnight finds that males substantially outnumbered females in net inter-state migration during both the decades 1930-40 and 1940-50. Over this period, although the rates for both sexes increased from the 1930's to the 1940's, approximately the same difference in the male and female rates were observed.[20]

The discrepancies between these two sets of observations are not necessarily irreconcilable, however; in effect, when as originally suggested by Ravenstein, distance and direction are controlled, it is found that women predominate in rural to urban, and in short distance movements. This fact can be linked primarily to the occupational aspirations of young rural women; they are more likely to look for employment opportunities, particularly in the domestic services or in industry, in the cities. In turn, young males predominate in long distance and rural to rural movements, and consequently, when investigating overall migration patterns, the contervailing trends tend to balance each other out.

16/ Cf. above footnotes 8 to 11.

17/ United Nations, Population Branch - "Demographic aspects of urbanization in Latin America", in P.M. Hauser (ed.) - Urbanization in Latin America, UNESCO, 1961, pp. 101-102.

18/ Jorge Arias - "Internal migration in Guatemala", Proceedings of the International Population Conference, N.Y. 1961, p. 400.

19/ Juan Elizaga - "Differential migration in Latin America, "Proceedings ... (ibid.) p. 418.

20/ Robert G. Burnight - "Internal migrations in Mexico", "Proceedings ... (ibid), p. 468.

According to these perspectives, we would expect Bogotá to attract a disproportionate amount of female migrants, other urban areas (since they are made up of both large metropolitan areas, small towns and all intermediate size cities) to have a diminished though still important majority of female migrants; lastly, rural areas could be expected to attract a disproportionate number of male migrants.

Table 7 does in fact indicate that these are the prevailing patterns. Fifty-six per cent of all migrants to Bogotá were females; moreover, women predominated in all migrant age cohorts except the 30-39 group where men had a slight majority. Women made up 54 per cent of all migrants to other urban areas and again they predominate in all cohorts except the 30-39 category. By contrast, a strong majority (59 per cent) of all migrants to rural areas were men, and this sex predominated in all age groups without exception.

The age-sex composition of migrants in Colombia thus exhibits a general pattern in conformity with that which could be expected on the basis of selectivity principles consistently corroborated in Latin American studies of migration. The overwhelming majority of recent migrants are young when they arrive at their destination; moreover, women predominate in migration streams to towns and cities while migrations to rural areas include a substantial majority of men. These differentials would appear to evolve naturally from the structure of employment opportunities available in each of the destination areas.

c)   Marital Status of Migrants

Surprisingly little has been written concerning the marital characteristics of migrants in Latin American migration streams. This dearth of analysis stems not from any lack of interest with the problem since evidently the impact of differentials in marital status will be large for the social systems of receiving areas. Rather, the neglect of marital status stems from the simple fact that migration data, especially from census materials, are not customarily disposed in such a manner as to make possible the investigation of marital status in a routine manner. However, present data from the OMUECE Colombia tabulations permit us to delve into this question at some length.

Taking an overall view of the comparative marital status of recent migrants and residents in table 8, several revealing patterns can be

Table 7

SEX RATIO OF RECENT MIGRANTS, BY AGE AND DESTINATION

| Age | DESTINATION | | |
	Bogotá	Other urban areas	Rural areas
10-19	62	71	130
20-29	95	88	141
30-39	101	108	148
40-49	90	98	165
50-59	57	94	150
60 +	47	77	140
Total	79	85	141

Source: OMUECE, table 23.

Table 8

COMPARATIVE MARITAL STATUS OF RESIDENTS, INTER-DAM MIGRANTS AND
INTER-DAI MIGRANTS, BY SEX AND DESTINATION

(in porcentages)

Marital Status	Capital		Other urban areas		Rural Areas	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
SINGLE						
Residents	50.2	48.8	55.5	50.9	54.7	46.0
Inter-DAI	–	–	60.4	57.4	57.9	41.8
Inter-DAM	65.4	62.3	61.8	55.7	61.4	40.5
MARRIED						
Residents	45.5	40.1	36.1	33.5	34.6	36.8
Inter-DAI	–	–	35.2	30.8	33.2	41.4
Inter-DAM	31.7	29.3	31.0	29.8	28.6	38.4
CONSENSUAL						
Residents	2.5	3.1	6.1	6.8	7.7	9.5
Inter-DAI	–	–	2.7	4.7	6.5	10.6
Inter-DAM	1.3	2.6	5.2	7.0	7.6	14.9
SEPARATED OR WIDOWED						
Residents	1.8	8.0	2.4	8.8	3.0	7.6
Inter-DAI	–	–	1.8	7.1	2.4	6.2
Inter-DAM	1.7	5.8	1.9	7.5	2.5	6.2

Source: ONUECE, table 20.

discerned.[21/] **Firstly,** recent migrants have a substantially higher proportion of single men and women than does the resident population of either capital or other urban areas but this does not hold for migrations to rural areas. In addition, the differential is much more accentuated in the capital than in other urban areas. In the 10 and over population of the capital, migrants have some 15 per cent more males and females who are single than residents while in urban areas, this proportion drops to some 6 per cent. By contrast, although recent male migrants to rural areas have a slightly higher proportion of single people than residents, the difference is more than compensated by the converse differential prevailing in the female population.

Evidently, residents in the capital and other urban areas have a higher percentage of men and women who are either married or living in consensual unions than do recent migrants; again, no consistent differences are found between residents and recent migrants to rural areas. Moreover, none of these relationships are consistently affiliated to short-distance (inter-municipio) and long-distance (inter-departamento) migration. Incidentally, it is of some interest that consensual marriages are considerably more frequent in rural areas than in urban areas and least common in Bogotá itself.

It should be remembered, however, that the data discussed above refer to aggregate totals of migrants and residents without exercising controls on any of several possible intervening variables except sex. The most important extraneous factor which can and should be controlled for concerns the age composition of the respective populations being compared. Indeed, it is perfectly plausible that the aforementioned patterns simply derive from the varying age structures of migrants and non-migrants and, in these circumstances, controlling for age becomes imperative. Tables 9 to 11 thus compare the marital status of recent migrants and residents by age and sex.

21/ In this and in subsequent comparisons between migrants and non-migrants, the possibility of standardizing for age was considered but rejected for two reasons. Firstly, the primary focus of this analysis is on the de facto adaptation of migrants to their receiving areas rather than on the theoretical adaptation which would occur if they had the same age structure as the resident population. Secondly, standardization in terms of receiving areas would make it impossible to compare migrants in different currents, thereby losing one of the primary instruments of analysis.

Table 9

BOGOTA: MARITAL STATUS OF RECENT MIGRANTS AND RESIDENTS, BY AGE AND SEX

(Percentages)

Age		Male					Female				
		Single	Married	Con-sensual	Separated or widowed	Total	Single	Married	Con-sensual	Separated or widowed	Total
10-19	Migrants	99.6	0.2	0.1	0.0	100.0	94.3	4.9	0.4	0.4	100.0
	Residents	99.4	0.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	95.4	4.1	0.4	0.1	100.0
20-29	Migrants	71.9	26.1	1.7	0.2	100.0	53.2	40.4	4.3	2.1	100.0
	Residents	56.2	39.8	3.9	0.1	100.0	42.9	50.6	4.9	1.6	100.0
30-39	Migrants	29.8	66.0	2.6	1.6	100.0	31.5	57.3	5.1	6.1	100.0
	Residents	16.7	77.0	4.7	1.6	100.0	21.8	67.3	5.8	5.1	100.0
40-49	Migrants	15.6	78.6	1.9	3.9	100.0	18.9	57.0	3.5	12.8	100.0
	Residents	9.5	84.2	4.1	2.2	100.0	26.7	65.8	3.0	12.3	100.0
50-59	Migrants	15.3	74.5	1.0	9.2	100.0	22.9	42.1	3.0	28.6	100.0
	Residents	8.3	85.0	1.4	5.2	100.0	26.3	49.9	2.3	24.9	100.0
60 +	Migrants	7.6	69.7	0.0	15.7	100.0	24.3	32.6	1.4	43.3	100.0
	Residents	8.9	73.9	1.6	22.7	100.0	22.7	26.1	1.2	48.4	100.0
Total	Migrants	65.4	31.7	1.3	1.7	100.0	48.8	29.3	2.6	5.8	100.0
	Residents	50.2	45.5	2.5	1.8	100.0	62.3	40.1	3.1	8.0	100.0

Table 10

URBAN AREAS: MARITAL STATUS OF RECENT MIGRANTS AND RESIDENTS, BY AGE AND SEX

(Percentages)

Age		Male					Female				
		Single	Married	Consensual	Separated or widowed	Total	Single	Married	Consensual	Separated or widowed	Total
10-19	Inter-DAI Migrants	99.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	94.0	4.2	1.6	0.2	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	99.6	0.3	0.1	0.0	100.0	91.2	5.4	3.2	0.3	100.0
	Residents	99.4	0.4	0.2	0.0	100.0	94.6	4.0	1.2	0.2	100.0
20-29	Inter-DAI Migrants	66.1	30.7	2.8	0.4	100.0	43.1	46.3	8.0	2.6	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	68.2	25.4	6.1	0.3	100.0	43.5	43.5	10.6	2.4	100.0
	Residents	60.3	31.7	7.4	0.6	100.0	43.1	43.8	10.6	2.5	100.0
30-39	Inter-DAI Migrants	23.6	69.2	5.4	1.9	100.0	22.2	60.3	8.6	8.9	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	28.8	59.1	10.5	1.7	100.0	24.7	56.3	11.4	7.5	100.0
	Residents	22.2	64.4	12.3	1.2	100.0	22.2	59.1	12.6	6.1	100.0
40-49	Inter-DAI Migrants	12.3	79.6	7.4	0.7	100.0	20.8	60.0	5.7	13.6	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	18.7	69.3	9.0	2.9	100.0	23.3	50.7	9.0	17.0	100.0
	Residents	14.1	72.1	11.2	2.6	100.0	20.7	56.5	10.5	12.3	100.0
50-51	Inter-DAI Migrants	15.3	76.7	2.0	6.0	100.0	25.3	42.3	2.7	29.7	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	15.4	68.7	7.7	8.2	100.0	22.1	43.1	6.1	28.7	100.0
	Residents	13.1	71.8	9.1	6.0	100.0	23.4	47.7	6.5	22.4	100.0
60 +	Inter-DAI Migrants	13.8	65.3	4.2	16.8	100.0	18.7	29.0	2.6	49.7	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	18.9	58.7	4.5	17.9	100.0	19.7	22.3	2.6	55.5	100.0
	Residents	12.8	64.0	7.0	16.2	100.0	24.6	28.7	3.3	43.4	100.0
Total	Inter-DAI Migrants	60.4	35.2	2.7	1.8	100.0	57.4	30.8	4.7	7.1	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	61.8	31.0	5.2	1.9	100.0	55.7	29.8	7.0	7.5	100.0
	Residents	55.5	36.1	6.1	2.4	100.0	50.9	33.5	6.8	8.8	100.0

Source: CMUECE, table 20.

- 21 -

Table 11

RURAL AREAS: MARITAL STATUS OF RECENT MIGRANTS AND RESIDENTS, BY AGE AND SEX

(Percentages)

Age		Male					Female				
		Single	Married	Consensual	Separated or widowed	Total	Single	Married	Consensual	Separated or widowed	Total
10-19	Inter-DAI Migrants	99.0	0.7	0.2	0.1	100.0	84.6	10.8	4.3	0.3	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	99.0	0.4	0.6	0.0	100.0	83.1	10.3	6.3	0.3	100.0
	Residents	99.3	0.4	0.3	0.0	100.0	92.1	5.5	2.2	0.2	100.0
20-29	Inter-DAI Migrants	62.5	29.1	8.0	0.4	100.0	22.9	58.7	15.6	2.8	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	67.4	24.1	7.4	1.1	100.0	21.4	54.4	22.3	2.0	100.0
	Residents	59.1	30.4	9.8	0.8	100.0	32.4	49.9	15.5	2.1	100.0
30-39	Inter-DAI Migrants	24.8	62.0	11.1	2.1	100.0	12.5	64.9	17.2	5.4	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	30.8	52.2	15.0	2.1	100.0	14.2	58.9	22.4	4.5	100.0
	Residents	22.7	60.6	14.6	2.1	100.0	16.9	62.0	16.1	5.0	100.0
40-49	Inter-DAI Migrants	16.7	63.8	13.2	6.3	100.0	14.0	60.6	12.4	13.0	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	24.1	56.4	14.5	5.0	100.0	16.0	53.5	15.4	15.1	100.0
	Residents	15.2	67.1	13.3	4.5	100.0	16.3	59.8	13.2	10.6	100.0
50-59	Inter-DAI Migrants	12.9	67.6	7.9	11.5	100.0	15.7	55.1	6.7	22.5	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	20.8	61.0	9.6	8.6	100.0	15.1	45.8	9.0	30.2	100.0
	Residents	13.0	67.6	12.2	7.1	100.0	16.8	53.5	10.2	19.5	100.0
60 +	Inter-DAI Migrants	11.1	68.7	6.1	14.1	100.0	22.8	26.1	3.3	47.8	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	16.6	56.1	9.2	18.1	100.0	16.9	29.7	9.3	44.2	100.0
	Residents	12.6	61.6	8.6	17.2	100.0	18.4	32.5	4.9	44.2	100.0
Total	Inter-DAI Migrants	57.9	33.2	6.5	2.4	100.0	41.8	41.4	10.6	6.2	100.0
	Inter-DAM Migrants	61.4	28.6	7.6	2.5	100.0	40.5	38.4	14.9	6.2	100.0
	Residents	54.7	34.6	7.7	3.0	100.0	46.0	36.8	9.5	7.6	100.0

Source: CMUECE, table 20.

In Bogotá, the previously-noted preponderance of recent migrants in the 'single' category is overwhelmingly confirmed for all age-sex groups. That is, the fact that 15 per cent more of total migrants than residents are single is due to the consistently higher proportion of single migrants rather than to any variation which might be occasioned by differential age structures. Bearing out this statement lies the concomitant observation that recent migrants have a consistently lower proportion of men and women in all age groups who are either married or living in consensual unions.

In other urban areas of Bogotá, these differentials still prevail but they are less trenchant and consequently greater attention has to be paid to analysis by sub-groups. First of all, recent male migrants, whether of the inter-department or inter-municipality type, again have a consistently higher proportion of single people in all age groups; similarly when married men or women are added to the corresponding groups living in consensual unions, these residents again demonstrate a higher proportion in this combined category than do either short or long distance migrants.

Secondly it can be seen in table 10 that female migrants to urban areas have a higher proportion of single people than do residents in all age groups except the two extreme categories of 10-19 and 60 plus. As a result the migrants, overall, have some 6 per cent more single women than do residents. Concomitantly, women residents are consistently more likely to be living in a cohabiting union than are their migrant counterparts in all age groups.

It is of some significance that male migrants to rural areas show the same relative advantage in the unmarried category and the same inferiority in the cohabiting categories as did their counterparts to streams to Bogotá and other urban places. Moreover, it can be observed that long-distance migration streams have a consistently higher proportion of unattached males than do the short-distance ones. Neither of these generalizations holds true for the female migrants to rural areas, however, since the latter tend to have a smaller percentage of single women in all age groups than do residents. Conversely, when the respective proportion of migrant and non-migrant women in both types of cohabiting union are summed up, then it is seen that rural migrant women have a substantial advantage in this category.

One logical explanation for this divergent pattern is suggested by the
relatively diminutive size of the female migrant contingent to rural areas.
Indeed, it will be recalled that whereas female migrants to Bogotá and to
other urban areas were considerably more numerous than males, the reverse is
true in rural streams. As a matter of fact, female migrants constitute only
44 per cent of inter-municipality migrants and 31 per cent of inter-department
migrants. Yet, the absolute number of female migrants who are married or
living in consensual unions is practically equal to that of male migrants.
The resulting higher proportion of female migrants in cohabiting unions would
therefore suggest that a substantial number of these married women are
accompanying their husbands in the move to rural areas rather than travelling
alone. [22]

Overall then, it is clear from present evidence that migrants of both
sexes and in all streams are predominantly unattached young people striking
out for a new life on their own. The one exception to this rule concerns
female migrants to rural areas who, it can be assumed, come largely to accompany
their husbands. But even this exception does not detract from the fact that
migration is primarily undertaken by single people. In movements to the
capital, 63 per cent of all migrants are single; the corresponding percentage
for urban areas is 58 and for rural areas 53 per cent.

In each of these three destination areas, women are more likely to be
married than men yet more than half of all migrant women are single. It has
even been suggested that one of the motives prompting women to migrate might
be the search for a husband. The data shown in table 12 do show that whether
or not this was a conscious motive, a substantial number of migrant women do
in fact find a spouse within a relatively short time of arrival at their
destination.

Indicentally, table 12 also demonstrates that an even higher proportion
of all migrants are single at the time of their move than was suggested in
tables 9 through 11. Indeed, when migrant women are subdivided into two groups
according to duration of residence at destination, then it is found that the

---

[22] Were it not for the aforementioned discrepancies in the data relating
to younger age groups, an indirect test of the hypothesis of family
movements to rural areas could be carried out using such measures as
the child-women ratio.

Table 12

MARITAL STATUS OF RECENT FEMALE MIGRANTS, ACCORDING
TO DURATION OF RESIDENCE, BY AGE AND DESTINATION

(Percentages)

Age	Capital		Other urban areas		Rural areas	
	Less than 1 year of residence	1 - 4 years of residence	Less than 1 year of residence	1 - 4 years of residence	Less than 1 year of residence	1 - 4 years of residence
Single						
10 - 19	96.1	93.3	92.3	92.0	81.0	84.5
20 - 29	54.4	52.4	46.9	35.0	26.7	19.0
30 - 39	42.9	25.8	27.4	21.7	14.7	12.3
40 - 49	28.1	24.3	24.8	21.1	16.8	14.2
50 - 59	27.8	24.4	20.8	24.4	17.6	13.6
60 +	24.1	19.0	14.7	22.4	15.9	20.8
Total	69.6	59.8	60.1	55.0	41.7	40.1
Married or consensual						
10 - 19	3.4	6.4	7.3	7.8	18.7	15.2
20 - 29	41.5	46.1	50.0	48.7	70.0	79.4
30 - 39	50.5	68.2	64.2	70.6	80.1	83.1
40 - 49	56.1	64.0	58.9	62.9	66.5	72.6
50 - 59	48.7	44.2	48.0	48.1	50.9	60.7
60 +	41.4	41.3	30.9	32.0	36.2	40.6
Total	25.1	35.5	33.4	38.9	51.6	54.9
Separated or widowed						
10 - 19	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.3
20 - 29	4.1	1.4	3.1	1.9	3.3	1.6
30 - 39	6.6	6.0	8.4	7.7	5.2	4.6
40 - 49	15.8	11.7	16.3	15.9	16.7	13.1
50 - 59	23.2	31.3	31.2	27.5	31.5	25.7
60 +	34.5	39.7	54.4	45.6	47.9	38.6
Total	5.3	4.8	6.5	6.1	6.6	5.0
Total						
10 - 19	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
20 - 29	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
30 - 39	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
40 - 49	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
50 - 59	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
60 +	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

more recent arrivals to Bogotá or to other urban areas have a substantially
higher proportion of single women than do those who have one to four years
of residence. The fact that duration of residence has no systematic influence
on the marriage rate of rural migrants tends to corroborate the previously-
formulated hypothesis of a high toll of family movement to these areas.

2. Characteristics determining the economic adaptation of migrants

From an economic standpoint, perhaps the most important consequence
which derives from the demographic composition of migrant streams relates to
its impact on the physical and quantitative ability of migrants to productively
enter the labour force of receiving areas. Since, as shown in the above
section, migrants are predominantly young and unattached, receiving areas
are theoretically favoured by the constant influx of people who are, physically
at least, capable of entering the labour force in larger numbers than the native
population. In turn, sending areas are deprived of a substantial segment of
their young manpower.

But, whether or not the migrants are qualitatively, as well as physically,
capable of entering the labour force of receiving areas in larger numbers than
the native population is another matter. Indeed, it is not at all impossible
that receiving areas experience over-migration in relation to their manpower
needs or that migrants are relatively unequipped to participate productively
in the economy of their receiving areas. The following pages will be addressed
to the problem of the qualitative contribution of migrants to the labour force
of receiving areas.

a) Literacy and Education

Two seemingly conflicting hypotheses can be entertained regarding the
ability of migrants to enter the labour force of receiving areas. The first
maintains that migrants are recruited primarily from the better-educated,
more intelligent or more capable sectors of the population; in such a perspective,
the migrants are either well-trained or more apt to be trained, particularly
alert to changing opportunities and mobile enough to take advantage of them.

The second hypothesis claims that educational opportunities in regions
of heavy out-migration are so limited that migrants have usually had little
formal training in comparison to the residents at their destination and
consequently, are destined to enter the lowest occupational and income strata.

Both of these hypotheses probably have some validity, inasmuch as they characterize different situations. To the extent that migrants are responding primarily to pull factors at their area of destination, we would expect them to be positively selected. But, when negative factors in the area of origin prompt most of the decisions to move, it can be expected that migration would be selective of the least trained and least capable segments of the population since these would be the first to feel the squeeze.

Judging from available data relating to migrations in other Latin American areas, it would appear that both hypotheses are tenable, but that the greatest proportion of migrants are likely to be recruited from the less-educated and less-trained segments of the population. Surveys carried out in Salvador, Lima and Santiago all agree that, in general, the level of education of migrants to these areas is inferior to that of the native population; the differential is accentuated as concerns female migrants since this group generally has a lower level of education than male migrants and a much lower level than the female non-migrants in urban areas.[23] But on the other hand, an interesting observation is made by Herrick, who points out that migrants tend to come from both extremes of the educational scale, having a greater proportion of both illiterates and university graduates than the native population.[24]

Similar findings in Salvador [25] lend credence to both of the hypotheses stated above and suggest that migration selectivity in terms of educational and occupational training is the result of a two-fold process; on the one hand, inferior educational facilities, particularly in rural areas, are at the root of lower educational levels among migrants. At the same time, individuals having attained a high level of education in smaller centers may have difficulty finding positions corresponding to their levels of skills and are thus more prone to migrate. Similarly, these individuals are likely to have more knowledge of opportunities and are capable of taking advantage of them. This stream of well-educated migrants in turn, will be accentuated by the flow of urban to urban migrants who are reacting primarily to pull factors in employment opportunities.

23/ Cf. footnotes 9 to 11, above.

24/ Herrick, op. cit, p. 77.

25/ United Nations, ECLA - Aspectos Demográficos..., San Salvador, op. cit. pp. 41-42.

To what extent is the selectivity of the most and least-trained elements characteristic of migration streams to Colombia? On the basis of the foregoing arguments, we would expect:

1) that migrants to Bogotá are better-educated than those to other urban areas and the latter, in turn, to have an educational advantage over migrants to rural areas.

2) in comparison to the native population, the educational composition in each stream will be marked by disproportionate amounts in both extreme categories.

A first glimpse of the relative training of migrants and non-migrants is provided by the information on literacy presented in table 13. Comparing recent migrants amongst themselves, it can be seen that the youngest migrants in all three currents, tend to be better educated, thus reflecting one of two phenomena - either a considerable movement of young people towards the better educational centers or, overall improvements in the educational system at all levels.

It is also clear that illiterate men and women are most likely to swell migration streams to rural areas and least likely to be headed for Bogotá. Nevertheless, recent migrants to the capital tend to have a higher proportion of illiterate individuals than does the resident population; these differences are particularly noteworthy among women and among the older age groups of both sexes. Recent migrants to other urban areas have basically the same proportion of illiterates as the remainder of the population of these areas while migrants to rural areas have a substantial advantage over residents in most age-sex categories.

Looking next at the relative educational composition of migration flows to Bogotá, to other urban areas and to rural areas, table 14 shows a distinct and consistent pattern. Migrants to Bogotá are undeniably better educated than their counterparts heading for other urban areas. Similarly, the latter migrants hold a distinct and sizeable advantage over migrants going to rural areas. These differences are significant across every age and sex cohort.

Table 13

LITERACY OF RESIDENTS AND RECENT MIGRANTS, BY AGE, SEX AND DESTINATION

(in percentages)

Age	Capital		Other urban areas		Rural areas	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
10-19						
Migrants	94.6	89.6	88.5	86.6	63.6	64.1
Residents	96.3	94.9	88.9	89.8	63.8	67.7
20-29						
Migrants	96.0	88.2	90.6	87.0	71.1	67.7
Residents	96.8	91.8	90.3	87.8	66.7	63.2
30-39						
Migrants	93.0	82.5	88.5	80.5	67.1	59.9
Residents	94.7	87.8	87.1	83.1	61.8	53.5
40 +						
Migrants	87.3	68.8	80.5	70.3	59.6	47.9
Residents	91.3	76.7	79.7	70.6	52.4	39.0
Total						
Migrants	93.9	85.0	87.6	82.9	65.6	61.4
Residents	94.9	88.0	86.3	82.7	60.8	56.5

Source: OMUECE, tables 15 and 23.

Table 14

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF RECENT MIGRANTS TO VARIOUS DESTINATION AREAS, BY AGE AND SEX

(Percentages)

		Male					Female				
		No school ing	1 - 3 years	4 - 9 years	10 and over	Total	No school ing	1 - 3 years	4 - 9 years	10 and over	Total
10-19	Capital	4.6	42.7	51.8	1.0	100.0	12.5	54.5	32.6	0.4	100.0
	Urban	12.6	45.9	40.7	0.8	100.0	20.4	50.0	29.4	0.1	100.0
	Rural	36.1	51.1	12.7	0.1	100.0	33.9	46.3	19.7	-	100.0
20-29	Capital	4.0	30.6	52.4	13.0	100.0	14.4	37.0	41.3	7.3	100.0
	Urban	9.1	35.9	46.9	8.1	100.0	16.7	42.0	37.4	3.9	100.0
	Rural	29.1	47.3	22.6	1.0	100.0	32.2	37.7	28.0	2.1	100.0
30-39	Capital	6.7	27.9	44.8	20.6	100.0	23.8	29.2	40.0	6.9	100.0
	Urban	10.4	32.2	46.1	11.3	100.0	24.4	35.8	35.8	3.9	100.0
	Rural	33.4	43.7	21.2	1.6	100.0	40.1	33.1	23.2	3.5	100.0
40-49	Capital	9.6	30.4	39.2	20.8	100.0	30.1	30.1	30.1	9.6	100.0
	Urban	16.6	33.4	41.6	8.4	100.0	36.1	27.9	31.2	4.9	100.0
	Rural	39.7	40.7	17.9	1.6	100.0	55.5	25.8	17.4	1.3	100.0
Total	Capital	5.5	32.3	48.6	13.6	100.0	15.6	43.7	36.5	4.2	100.0
	Urban	11.7	35.9	44.5	7.8	100.0	21.8	42.5	33.2	2.5	100.0
	Rural	34.0	45.9	19.1	1.1	100.0	38.9	37.1	22.4	1.6	100.0

Source: CMUECE, Table 25.

It might be objected that part of the variation may be due to the differential accessibility of educational facilities in each of the three areas under consideration. That is, migrants to Bogotá, for instance, would be better educated than those to other urban areas simply because of a more widespread school enrollment characterizing the former. It is indeed possible that this condition exercises some influence, but that is sure to be minimal since we are dealing here with recent migrants, i.e., individuals who have been residing for less than five years in their current place of residence. Consequently, for the most part, whatever education they have received, was given to them prior to their arrival at destination. This is, of course, particularly true in all age groups over twenty where education is essentially a static characteristic.

Hence, our first hypothesis concerning the selectivity by education of migrants in various streams was resoundingly borne out; the more educated the migrant, the more likely he is to choose a larger urban-industrial center of attraction as his destination. With respect to the second hypothesis - that migrants in any given stream will include a disproportionate amount from both extremes of the educational scale - the picture presented by tables 14 and 15 is less clear.

Migrants to the city of Bogotá, for instance, have the same proportion as all other residents in the "no-schooling" category and a larger share having had only one to three years of schooling. Conversely, they have a smaller percentage in each of the two higher educational groups. Examination of differentials by age-sex groups sheds little further light since the differences are contradictory by age in both sexes.

With regards to all other urban areas of Colombia, recent male migrants show a slightly higher proportion than the remainder of the resident population of those areas in the highest educational level and a concomitant smaller proportion in the 'no-schooling' category, with the two intermediary groups showing no differences. The educational status of recent women migrants is considerably inferior to that of the remaining female population in that the former have a larger proportion in the two lowest educational categories and a smaller one in the two highest strata. Interestingly enough, recent migrants to rural areas, who were earlier shown to be the least-educated of all migrants, have a notable educational advantage over their resident counterparts in their new place of residence; this advantage is consistent for most age cohorts amongst both male and female migrants.

Table 15

COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF RECENT MIGRANTS AND RESIDENTS, BY AGE, SEX AND DESTINATION

(Percentages)

	No schooling		1 - 3 years		4 - 9 years		10 and over years		Total	
	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents
Capital										
Male										
10 - 19	4.6	4.8	42.7	36.7	51.8	56.9	1.0	1.6	100.0	100.0
20 - 29	4.0	3.3	30.6	20.5	52.4	59.0	13.0	17.2	100.0	100.0
30 - 39	6.7	5.2	27.9	27.6	44.8	50.2	20.6	16.9	100.0	100.0
40 +	9.6	7.5	30.4	25.6	39.2	48.1	20.8	18.8	100.0	100.0
Total	5.5	5.4	32.3	25.8	48.6	52.8	13.6	16.1	100.0	100.0
Female										
10 - 19	12.5	9.5	54.5	34.8	32.6	52.9	0.4	2.9	100.0	100.0
20 - 29	14.4	9.8	37.0	30.6	41.3	50.5	7.3	9.1	100.0	100.0
30 - 39	23.8	12.3	29.2	31.0	40.0	48.6	6.9	8.1	100.0	100.0
40 - 49	30.1	24.2	30.1	29.0	30.1	38.9	9.6	7.8	100.0	100.0
Total	15.6	13.8	43.7	31.0	36.5	47.6	4.2	7.6	100.0	100.0
Urban										
Male										
10 - 19	12.6	14.8	45.9	41.7	40.7	42.8	0.8	0.6	100.0	100.0
20 - 29	9.1	9.7	35.9	33.6	46.9	50.5	8.1	6.2	100.0	100.0
30 - 39	10.4	12.6	32.2	34.5	46.1	46.2	11.3	6.6	100.0	100.0
40 +	16.6	18.6	33.4	35.0	41.6	40.8	8.4	5.6	100.0	100.0
Total	11.7	14.3	35.9	35.3	44.5	44.9	7.8	5.5	100.0	100.0
Female										
10 - 19	20.4	15.5	50.0	44.9	29.4	38.8	0.1	0.8	100.0	100.0
20 - 29	16.7	12.9	42.0	32.6	37.4	49.3	3.9	5.1	100.0	100.0
30 - 39	24.4	18.8	35.8	35.6	35.8	42.2	3.9	3.4	100.0	100.0
40 +	36.1	30.5	27.9	30.5	31.2	36.6	4.9	2.4	100.0	100.0
Total	21.8	19.6	42.5	35.1	33.2	42.2	2.5	3.1	100.0	100.0
Rural										
Male										
10 - 19	36.1	37.1	51.1	49.7	12.7	13.2	0.1	0.0	100.0	100.0
20 - 29	29.1	33.1	47.3	49.9	22.6	16.6	1.0	0.4	100.0	100.0
30 - 39	33.4	38.1	43.7	46.4	21.2	15.0	1.6	0.4	100.0	100.0
40 +	39.7	46.2	40.7	40.2	17.9	13.1	1.6	0.5	100.0	100.0
Total	34.0	39.4	45.9	45.9	19.1	14.3	1.1	0.4	100.0	100.0
Female										
10 - 19	33.9	36.3	46.3	44.6	19.7	19.0	-	-	100.0	100.0
20 - 29	32.2	40.7	37.7	36.1	28.0	22.3	2.1	1.0	100.0	100.0
30 - 39	40.1	51.8	33.1	31.3	23.2	16.4	3.5	0.4	100.0	100.0
40 +	55.5	66.5	25.8	22.0	17.4	11.3	1.3	0.3	100.0	100.0
Total	38.9	51.3	37.1	31.8	22.4	16.5	1.6	0.4	100.0	100.0

Source: OMUECE, tables 13 and 25.

In brief, the available evidence would indicate that although recent migrants to Bogotá are the best-educated of all migrant groups, overall, their educational attainment still does not compare favorably with that of the resident population. Male migrants to other urban areas have a slight advantage over residents but the same is not true of female migrants. Rural migrants, however, show a distinct educational superiority over the migrant population. Taken collectively, these several findings do not bolster the previously-formulated hypothesis that migrants tend to be selective of both the best and least-trained elements of the population. Nevertheless, the hypothesis cannot, as yet, be discarded since peculiarities of the data themselves may account for the present findings.

Indeed, it must be considered that:

1) as explained before, education is basically a static characteristic in the present instance;

2) the nature of the tabulations utilized here force us to compare recent migrants with all other residents; since the latter groups is made up not only of the native population but also of all other previous migrants, then the comparison between recent migrants and all others in terms of a static characteristic such as educational attainment is jeopardized by the inclusion of previous migrants into the "Others" category. Hence, the only firm conclusion which can be drawn from the previously considerations on educational status is that which refers to the various streams of migrants. That is, Bogotá attracts the best educated and rural areas the least educated migrants.

b)   Labour Force Participation

Analysis of the demographic composition of migration flow in Colombia led us to conclude that migrants to all three destination areas under consideration are predominantly selective of the young and unattached population. All other things being equal, such a population structure should be translated into a higher rate of economic activity by migrants to all three destination areas.

In this light, it is suggestive that a recent thoroughgoing analysis of employment in Colombia concludes that:

"In all cities except Bogotá, half or more of the unemployed were born in the city or within the neighbouring department, and the proportion of locally-born persons is generally somewhat higher among first-time job seekers. Perhaps more surprising is the fact that the migrants in all the cities surveyed have much higher participation rates and significantly lower unemployment rates among locally-born persons. In Bogotá, for instance, the rate of unemployment among native-born persons was 23 per cent, among persons born somewhere else in the department 12 per cent, and among others, 15 per cent. Although a good part of this difference can probably be explained by differences in the ages of the two groups, the lower rates of unemployment among immigrants may well have important links with migration and thus deserve further study". [26]

Viewed in this connection, it is thus of considerable interest that in table 16, migrants to all three areas under focus do in fact tend to have a higher proportion of their totals in the economically-active category than do the natives at their respective destinations. [27] This conclusion is valid for the totals of both males and females. Closer scrutiny of variations by age group, however, reveals that in the case of males, the recent migrants' advantage is traceable solely to a disproportionately high number of young men aged 10-19 who are economically active. This would thus imply that recent migrants have a higher percentage of economically-active men simply because they have a much smaller proportion of their young people attending school.

In the case of females, the higher proportion of economically-active recent migrants is verifiable in all age groups of each migration current.

[26] United Nations, ILO - Towards Full Employment, A Programme for Colombia, International Labour Office, Geneva, 1970, Appendix 1, p. 7.

[27] As defined in the Colombian census, the economically active population is defined as "aquella de 12 años y más, (in the CMUECE sample this is changed to 10 years and over), que durante el año censal ejerció una ocupación remunerada en la producción de bienes o servicios, y la que en condición de 'ayudantes familiares' trabajó sin remuneración en la empresa de su respectivo jefe de familia o pariente por lo menos durante un tercio del tiempo normal de trabajo. Dentro del año censal o período de referencia, el censo establece un límite de duración de actividad, continua o discontinua, de nueve meses, para la denominación de 'ocupados' y 'no ocupados'." República de Colombia, Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística - XII Censo Nacional de Población, 15 de julio de 1964. Resumen General.

Table 16

PERCENT OF THE 10 AND OVER POPULATIONS OF RECENT MIGRANTS AND RESIDENTS WHO ARE
ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE, BY AGE, SEX AND DESTINATION

Age	Male						Female					
	Bogotá		Other urban areas		Rural areas		Bogotá		Other urban areas		Rural areas	
	Mi-grants	Resi-dents	Mi-grants	Resi-dents	Mi-grants	Resi-dents	Mi-grants	Resi-dents	Mi-grants	Resi-dents	Mi-grants	Resi-dents
10 - 19	21.3	44.0	21.4	30.5	48.7	57.8	14.8	46.9	11.3	26.2	5.9	11.4
20 - 29	88.1	85.8	88.9	88.1	97.3	97.3	42.3	51.2	29.8	35.0	11.2	15.3
30 - 39	97.5	93.0	97.0	94.4	98.8	98.4	33.8	37.6	22.6	29.0	11.9	13.5
4C +	86.7	81.7	85.2	85.1	92.1	93.2	25.2	16.9	17.3	19.6	13.0	14.4
Total	68.3	73.5	64.4	69.2	78.7	84.0	28.0	42.4	18.8	27.9	10.0	13.5

Source: OMUECE, tables 5, 23 and 25.

- 35 -

Again, however, a higher rate of participation in economically-gainful occupations may be a mixed blessing since, in the present instance, it is almost sure to indicate that recent female migrants are more often forced to take up gainful employment in order to supplement a meagre family wage. Conversely, the remainder of the population has a higher proportion of housewives who can afford the luxury of not taking a job.

Thus, although recent migrants to Bogotá, other urban areas and rural areas would, at first glance, appear to be favoured by a higher rate of participation in the economically-active labour force, the decomposition of this higher rate by age and sex groups would imply that the situation may be globally unfavourable to recent migrants. Indeed, the recent migrants have a higher activity rate exactly in the least-productive segments of the population. On the other hand, it could be argued that, whatever the structure of their economically active populations, the fact remains that, here and now, the dependency burden among residents is higher than among recent migrants; that is, the active residents have to support a higher proportion of inactive individuals than do migrants.

Evidently, a more complete analysis of this question could be carried out if data on participation rates were to be completed by data on unemployment, underemployment and on the proportion of housewives and students in each of the migrant and non-migrant groups. Nevertheless, further light will be provided by an examination of the migrants' occupational adaptation.

c)   Occupational Adaptation

The previous sections demonstrated that migrants predominate in the unattached and young working age groups and have higher rates of participation in the labour force than do residents. These circumstances, considered per se, would denote a favourable adaptation of migrants and would tend to be generally positive for receiving areas since migrants are, physically at least, capable of entering the labour force in larger numbers than the native population.

Tempering this statement comes the observation that, at least in Bogotá, migrants are less literate and educated than residents. Moreover, the advantage of migrants in terms of total participation in the labour force stems solely from a disproportionate number in the least-productive age-sex cohorts. Consequently, it remains questionable whether the migrants' favourable dependency ratio connotes real advantages. The following pages will present

data on the *de facto* adaptation of migrants. The migrants' qualitative penetration of the occupational structure of receiving areas will be investigated at several complementary levels.

In a sense, the data relating to occupational status are the most **crucial in terms of gauging the adjustment and relative contribution of** migrants to their receiving areas. Unfortunately, this indicator, in its several dimensions, is also founded upon the most problematic and ambiguous of concepts. Definitions of employment, unemployment and under-employment are necessary yet they vary greatly and generally leave a great deal to be desired, especially when one attempts to operationalize them. Classifications of occupation, occupational category and branch of economic activity are all constituted of heterogeneous status categories and certain fundamental assumptions have to be made in order to be able to utilize these categories at all.[28] Moreover, fundamental differences in the economic structure of each of the receiving areas obstruct comparisons of occupational adaptation to these areas.

These difficulties notwithstanding, no one can afford to simply overlook the question of occupational adjustment since it is central to the dynamics of migration and to the process of migrant assimilation. In the present instance, certain basic assumptions had to be made about status ranking in the various approaches to the classification of occupation and these will be made evident within the context of each of the following sub-sections. It should be stressed, however, that the formulation of such judgements in no wise connotes a disregard for the real heterogeneity and overlap between categories; it simply implies that a given grouping is considered to be, at the aggregate level, more favoured than another, despite individual discrepancies within and between classes.

28/ For a review of this problem and a thoughtful critique of existing classificatory schemes, cf. Joseph Hodara - *En torno al mercado del empleo en Latinoamérica*, CEPAL, primer borrador. For more specific references to the measurement of unemployment and underemployment in Colombia, cf. R.L. Slighton - "Urban employment in Colombia, Measurement, Definitions and Policy Problems", Rand, 1968; and ILO (*op. cit.*) chapter I - "The employment problem".

i) Occupation [29]

Looking at the relative distribution of recent migrants and all others in terms of occupation in table 17, several revealing patterns can be noted. Initially, with reference to the capital, recent migrants to Bogotá tend to have a higher proportion of its population than do residents in non-manual occupations (i.e., professionals, technicians, managers, administrators, office workers, salespersons, etc.). The differential is applicable to both men and women but is particularly pronounced among women where migrants have only one-half as many non-manual workers as do the residents. Migrants have a concomitant numerical advantage in the armed forces, service activities, primary activities (agriculture, mining, forestry, hunting, fishing, etc.) with the remaining occupations showing little difference between migrants and residents.

In other urban areas of Colombia, migrants again have a higher proportion of residents in the armed forces and in service activities and, a lesser percentage in skilled or semi-skilled artesanery and transport. But, in contrast to the situation prevailing in Bogotá, recent male migrants to other urban areas actually have a slightly higher ratio than residents in non-manual activities (although this is not at all true for female migrants) and a smaller percentage in primary activities than does the resident population. [30]

In short, the occupational situation of migrants to other urban areas appears to be somewhat more favourable than that of migrants to Bogotá when both of these are compared to the respective resident populations of these two areas. Nevertheless, when the occupational structure of migrants to Bogotá and to other urban areas is compared to each other, then it appears that the former displays a more favourable distribution in the sense that migrants to Bogotá have a higher proportion in non-manual activities and in skilled or semi-skilled artesanery, while having a lesser percentage engaged in low status primary activities.

[29] "Por 'ocupación' se entiende la profesión u oficio que el trabajador remunerado desempeña habitualmente durante el año censal, ya sea que se encontrase trabajando o no en la fecha censal". República de Colombia - XII Censo. (op. cit.).

[30] Data on occupation are unavailable by age.

Table 17

OCCUPATION OF RECENT MIGRANTS AND RESIDENTS, BY SEX AND DESTINATION

(Percentages)

| | Male | | | | | | Female | | | | | |
| | Capital | | Other urban areas | | Rural areas | | Capital | | Other urban areas | | Rural areas | |
Occupation	Mi-grants	Resi-dents	Mi-grants	Resi-dents	Mi-grants	Resi-dents	Mi-grants	Resi-dents	Mi-grants	Resi-dents	Mi-grants	Resi-dents
1. Non manual												
a) Professionals, mgrs., etc.	(12.5)	(15.2)	(11.7)	(9.2)	(2.4)	(0.9)	(8.4)	(12.8)	(12.6)	(12.5)	(16.9)	(5.9)
b) Office and sales	(19.8)	(21.2)	(15.1)	(15.4)	(2.0)	(1.2)	(12.0)	(27.4)	(9.5)	(20.7)	(5.1)	(3.9)
c) Total	32.3	36.4	26.8	24.7	4.4	2.1	20.4	40.2	22.1	33.2	22.0	9.8
2. Primary sector activities	4.6	2.4	17.5	22.0	81.3	92.0	0.5	0.3	1.2	2.4	15.7	44.4
3. Transport	5.2	8.2	6.3	7.2	1.7	0.8	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1
4. Artesanery	31.5	37.5	24.3	31.3	5.5	3.3	8.3	16.9	9.8	21.3	5.8	20.0
5. Other manual workers and street vendors	4.0	3.2	4.0	4.2	1.1	0.5	0.4	1.2	0.6	1.3	0.4	0.5
6. Services	10.1	5.9	9.1	5.8	2.5	0.8	67.6	36.6	63.5	38.1	55.3	24.0
7. Armed Forces	6.1	0.9	6.8	0.3	2.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
8. Others	6.2	5.4	5.2	4.5	0.8	0.5	2.8	4.6	2.5	3.2	0.6	1.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The situation of female migrants to urban areas, however, is analogous
to that of their counterparts in the capital in the sense that both have a lower
proportion in non-manual activities and a much higher proportion in service
occupations than do residents.

Finally, with respect to rural areas, the overwhelming proportion of both
migrants and residents are understandably concentrated in primary activities.
Nevertheless, it is of some interest that migrants, particularly females, enjoy
a considerable advantage in non-manual activities, and a smaller superiority in
artesanery. But, on the other hand, migrants also have a substantial margin in
the lower status service activities, suggesting that migrants to rural areas
possibly enter the occupational structure of these regions at both the highest
and lowest levels.

ii) Occupational Category [31]/

The comparison of recent migrants with all other residents in terms
of occupational category has to be carried out separately for males and females
in order to be comprehensible.

Looking first at the economically-active male population of Bogotá, table 18
indicates that recent migrants are, overall, less likely to be found in the two
leading status groups of employers and self-employed businessmen. The differences
are not great, however, and moreover, do not hold up through all age groups; in
fact, older migrants (i.e., those aged 40 and over) actually have a noticeable
edge in the two leading status categories. Both recent migrants and residents

---

[31]/ According to the Colombian census definition - "el concepto 'categoría de
ocupación' hace referencia a la posición de la persona dentro de la actividad
de producción de bienes o servicios, de conformidad con la clasificación
siguiente: a) empleadores - personas que durante el año censal explotaron
su propia empresa económica, con el concurso de trabajadores a quienes
dieron remuneración; b) trabajadores por cuenta propia. Aquellos que
explotaron su propia empresa económica y no dispusieron de trabajadores
remunerados, aun cuando pudieron contar con 'ayudantes familiares' no
remunerados; c) ayudantes familiares. Quienes ayudaron al jefe de familia
o pariente en su empresa económica, sin remuneración y durante un tiempo
mínimo equivalente a la tercera parte del tiempo normal de trabajo;
d) empleados. Las personas que realizaron bajo la dependencia de otra u
otras, en actividades de producción de bienes o de servicios, funciones
de administración, dirección, organización o vigilancia, a cambio de una
remuneración, y e) obreros. Los trabajadores que durante el año censal se
ocuparon directamente de la producción de bienes o servicios, en forma manual,
y bajo la dependencia de un patrón del que obtuvieron una remuneración, ya sea
fija, ya por unidad de trabajo". (República de Colombia - XII Censo (op. cit.).
It is unfortunate that in the OMUECE tabulations, the interesting distinction
between 'empleados' and 'obreros' apparently had to be dropped in order to
make these data comparable across countries.

Table 16

OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY OF RECENT MIGRANTS AND RESIDENTS, BY AGE, SEX AND DESTINATION

(Percentages)

Age and occupational category	Male						Female					
	Capital		Other urban areas		Rural areas		Capital		Other urban areas		Rural areas	
	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents
10 - 19 Employer	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.8	0.2
Own enterprise	4.8	4.7	7.2	10.0	4.8	8.4	0.2	1.8	1.9	6.8	4.5	16.9
Employee	93.3	92.1	87.0	78.8	71.7	42.3	99.3	96.8	96.6	90.4	87.3	52.4
Unremunerated family workers	1.6	3.0	5.8	10.9	23.3	48.9	0.6	1.2	1.3	2.7	7.4	30.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
20 - 29 Employer	1.5	3.5	2.0	2.5	4.1	6.4	0.2	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.1	2.4
Own enterprise	10.8	10.9	13.1	18.4	14.0	27.6	3.2	4.7	8.1	14.1	9.2	27.7
Employee	87.1	84.7	83.7	75.6	76.0	48.6	96.0	93.5	89.6	82.5	85.7	50.6
Unremunerated family workers	0.7	0.9	1.2	3.4	6.0	17.4	0.6	1.2	1.5	2.4	4.0	19.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
30 - 39 Employer	5.0	8.6	5.1	7.8	10.4	15.6	1.4	2.5	1.9	2.8	4.7	5.9
Own enterprise	16.3	19.6	21.4	28.0	22.0	39.2	11.3	13.2	15.1	26.2	12.8	37.3
Employee	78.1	71.7	73.3	63.4	66.1	41.0	86.6	83.1	81.9	68.5	77.9	41.2
Unremunerated family workers	0.6	0.0	0.2	0.8	1.4	4.1	0.7	1.2	1.2	2.4	4.7	15.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
40 - 49 Employer	11.3	11.0	8.9	11.6	12.6	20.0	2.6	6.3	2.5	6.0	8.3	11.6
Own enterprise	27.4	24.1	30.8	32.4	27.6	42.2	13.2	21.3	17.1	34.8	14.3	43.0
Employee	61.3	64.8	60.2	55.7	58.7	36.3	84.2	70.1	80.4	55.8	71.4	33.4
Unremunerated family workers	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2	1.1	1.5	-	2.4	-	3.4	6.0	11.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
50 - 59 Employer	16.3	12.5	10.8	14.8	19.6	24.6	0.0	5.8	3.4	5.9	17.0	17.6
Own enterprise	32.6	29.0	34.3	38.3	24.9	43.7	26.9	23.8	24.8	37.4	22.6	50.0
Employee	51.2	58.5	54.7	46.5	54.5	30.7	73.1	69.2	68.4	53.2	54.7	24.6
Unremunerated family workers	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.9	1.0	0.0	1.2	3.4	3.4	5.7	7.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
60 + Employer	11.1	19.2	10.1	15.4	18.6	26.6	8.3	6.7	4.8	5.5	4.2	24.4
Own enterprise	55.6	33.3	40.1	45.3	29.5	47.6	33.3	20.0	17.5	39.1	8.3	46.5
Employee	33.3	47.5	49.5	39.1	49.8	25.1	58.3	72.2	76.2	53.1	87.5	24.4
Unremunerated family workers	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.2	2.1	0.8	0.0	1.1	1.6	2.4	0.0	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Employer	3.8	7.5	4.2	7.6	7.1	12.5	0.4	2.3	1.0	2.5	3.5	7.6
Own enterprise	14.2	17.9	19.0	26.5	16.7	31.2	3.9	10.3	8.2	21.0	9.8	33.9
Employee	81.3	74.0	75.3	63.4	68.4	40.1	95.1	86.1	89.5	73.9	81.4	41.3
Unremunerated family workers	0.7	0.6	1.4	2.5	7.8	16.3	0.6	1.3	1.3	2.7	5.3	17.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: CMUECE, tables 10 and 21.

have their largest numbers in the employee category but the recent migrants aged 10-39 are more prominent than natives in this lower-status group while the opposite holds true for older age groups. Lastly, the unremunerated family workers' category includes but a negligible proportion of both groups.

In other urban areas, the differences favouring residents in terms of their proportion in the two leading status groups are larger and consistent throughout all age groups. Hence, recent male migrants have a systematically higher proportion in the employee category. The same is true of rural areas where resident men have a monotonic advantage over migrants in the two leading status groups and a resulting smaller proportion in the employee category. However, in rural areas, the 'unremunerated family workers' category takes on considerable importance, especially in the 10-19 age groups and here the residents hold a considerable edge. It is difficult to ascertain the significance of this factor but it can be argued that a higher proportion in this category is probably detrimental to residents.

In short, male migrants to all three areas under consideration would appear to be in lower-status positions than the corresponding cohorts of residents. The difference is relatively small and inconsistent in the capital but fairly well-defined in the other two destination areas.

With respect to females, the advantage held by residents of the three destination areas is large and significant across all age groups. That is, resident women in Bogotá, other urban areas and rural areas hold a definite edge over recent migrants in the two leading occupational categories and have a concomitantly lower proportion of employees. The only question mark appears when looking at unremunerated family workers in rural areas since migrant women (as did men) have a much lower proportion in this somewhat ambiguous category.

iii) Branch of economic activity [32]

The data relating to branch of economic activity in table 19 again have to be examined separately for males and females. With respect to men, the main differentials established therein are that recent male migrants to Bogotá and to other urban areas have a larger proportion in the services category and a correspondingly smaller proportion in manufacturing, construction and transport

[32] "La 'rama de actividad económica' se refiere a la clase de actividad del establecimiento o lugar donde trabajó la persona durante el año censal". Republica de Colombia - XII Censo, (op. cit.).

Table 19

BRANCH OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF RECENT MIGRANTS AND RESIDENTS, BY SEX AND DESTINATION

(Percentages)

Branch of economic activity	Male						Female					
	Bogotá		Other urban areas		Rural areas		Bogotá		Other urban areas		Rural areas	
	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents
Agriculture, ranching, hunting and fishing	4.1	2.2	16.2	20.8	79.7	91.0	0.3	0.3	1.3	2.0	21.8	42.9
Mining	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.5	4.6
Manufacturing	24.3	29.3	19.0	23.6	4.3	2.6	9.6	19.6	10.8	23.3	6.2	18.5
Construction	11.1	12.6	7.8	9.6	2.8	1.2	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.2
Electricity, gas, water, sanitation	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Commerce	16.9	16.6	15.2	16.2	2.3	1.3	7.3	15.0	7.2	14.8	4.0	4.1
Transport, wareh., and comm.	6.9	9.1	7.4	8.6	1.6	0.7	0.9	2.1	0.8	1.7	1.0	0.2
Personal services	4.4	3.9	4.9	3.9	0.9	0.5	64.2	35.3	59.0	36.4	45.9	21.8
Other services	22.2	16.4	21.3	9.5	6.0	1.2	13.1	19.6	17.6	15.9	19.4	6.0
Unspecified	9.1	8.6	6.5	6.1	0.9	0.6	4.1	7.2	2.9	5.0	0.8	1.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: CMUECE, tables 6 and 25.

activities than do residents. The remaining branches of economic activity
show very little variation as concerns the relative proportion of migrants
and non-migrants.

Practically two-thirds of all recent female migrants to Bogotá and a
slightly lesser proportion of those to other urban areas are employed in other
service activities, thereby lending considerable support to the off-repeated
but seldom-proven claim that cities exert a tremendous attractive force on
unskilled young rural women seeking employment as maids. By contrast, the
female resident population of Bogotá and other urban areas has only 35 per
cent of its total in personal service activities; conversely, residents have
a substantially higher ratio in manufacturing and commerce.

Evidently, agricultural activities engage the majority of both the migrant
and non-migrant population but it is interesting that recent male migrants are
under-represented in the agricultural sector by comparison to residents. The
differences are taken up gradually by each of the remaining sectors (mining,
manufacturing, construction, commerce and transportation) but it is particularly
expressive in the services category. Among active women, recent female migrants
are less likely than the remainder of the population to be engaged in agricultural
activities. But they are also under-represented in mining and manufacturing and,
as a result, practically dominate the services (especially the personal services)
sector.

iv) Proportion in Economically-Marginal Activities

In the context of the large-scale movements of population, rapid
urbanization and of the disassociation between the processes of industrialization
and urbanization which is often decried in Latin America, perhaps the more
important question which can be asked concerning the absorption of migrants
into the employment structures of their destination concerns the extent to
which migrants swell the economically-marginal sectors of the population.
Indeed, given the particular composition and function of the tertiary sector
which characterizes the Latin American economic structure, the high ratio of
migrants engaged in service activities, particularly in personal services,
would reinforce the notion that recent migrants demonstrate an inferior
occupational status. Moreover, migration is commonly held to be in excess
of employment opportunities and that consequently the migrants, who are in
their majority unskilled, are shuttled off into economically-marginal activities.

Seldom, however, has it been possible to conduct a direct test of this hypothesis and one of the merits of the CMUECE tabulations is that they have been arranged so as to permit an approximative exploration of this question.

In accordance with a time-honoured definition formulated by ECLA, marginal labour may be defined as "all those who live at the lowest income level - approaching subsistence levels - either because of the unproductive and non-essential nature of their occupations, or because work is irregular or unobtainable. Marginal labour, plus dependents, forms the marginal population".

The operational application of this definition is, however, variable, and to some extent, arbitrary. In the presently-utilized CMUECE tabulations, marginal activities were grouped into three main categories: a) self-employed individuals who sustain themselves as minifundio agriculturalists, as manual labourers and as street vendors, or in the services and unskilled artesanery; b) unpaid family workers in agriculture, in street vending and in manual labour; c) domestic servants.

Utilizing these cut-off points, the percentage of the 10 and over population of recent migrants engaged in marginal activities can be compared with the corresponding population of residents. Such a comparison, effected in table 20 brings to light a rather surprising fact: male migrants to Bogotá, to other urban areas and to rural areas all have a smaller proportion than do residents in marginal activities. The differential is minimal in the case of Bogotá, more substantial in other urban areas and greatest in rural areas. In each instance, the differential is largely constituted by the higher proportion of natives in self-employed marginal activities but then rural residents also have a substantially higher proportion in the unpaid family workers' category.

Incidentally, it is of some interest that the proportion of males, whether migrants or residents, who are engaged in marginal activities is sizeably smaller in Bogotá than in other urban areas and greatest in rural areas.

In the case of females, the relative ranking of migrants and residents in terms of their respective ratios in marginal activities is radically reversed - except in rural areas. Like their male counterparts, female migrants to Bogotá and to other urban areas also have somewhat lesser numbers in self-employed marginal activities but this difference is minimized and obliterated by the domination of migrant women in domestic services. In rural areas, a minimal proportion of all migrant women are engaged in any activities defined to be marginal, as are only 6 per cent of all resident females.

Table 20

COMPARISON OF RECENT MIGRANTS AND RESIDENTS IN TERMS OF THEIR PERCENTAGE
OF ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE LABOR FORCE IN MARGINAL ACTIVITIES

Sex	Destination					
	Capital		Other urban areas		Rural areas	
	Mi grants	Resi- dents	Mi grants	Resi- dents	Mi grants	Resi- dents
Male						
Self-employed	8.2	11.2	13.4	20.0	15.5	30.3
Unpaid family workers	0.3	0.0	1.1	1.9	7.6	16.0
Domestics	1.3	0.5	1.2	0.7	0.6	0.3
Total	9.8	11.7	15.7	22.6	23.7	46.6
Female						
Self-employed	3.2	8.0	7.0	16.6	8.8	29.1
Unpaid family workers	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.9	3.5	11.0
Domestics	61.4	28.6	53.4	29.4	48.8	21.3
Total	64.9	37.0	60.7	46.9	61.1	61.4

Source: CMUECE, tables 8 and 26.

But perhaps the examination of rates of marginal activity in the entire 10 and over population constitutes a somewhat truncated approach to the comparative study of marginal activity since it fails to control for the proportion of migrants and non-migrants who are actually in the labour force. What happens when we restrict the comparison to the economically-active population as in table 21?

Fundamentally, the previously-established conclusions remain unaltered; that is, among the economically-active, male migrants are again consistently less likely to be found in marginal activities while the situation is reversed for female migrants. Moreover, marginal activities are most predominant in the male population of rural areas and least important in Bogotá. But perhaps the most significant fact revealed by table 20 is that three-fifths of all economically-active migrant women, regardless of destination, are engaged in marginal activities, as compared to less than one-fifth of all male migrants.

In brief, the available data on participation in marginal economic activities would suggest that a distinctly different view has to be taken of male and female migration. Contrary to what would have been expected on the basis of the usual straightforward analysis of occupation and economic activity, male migrants are actually less likely to be involved in marginal activities than residents. On the other hand, female migrants undeniably swell the ranks of the subsistent populations engaged in unproductive activities.

Summary and Conclusions

Taken collectively, what do these data on the volume of migration flow and on the demographic and economic migration differentials suggest concerning the adaptability and productivity of migrants?

The absolute volume of migration in Colombia is, in itself, rather impressive; as of the 1964 census, one third of all native Colombians were residing in an administrative area other than that of their birth. The prevailing direction of this trend is urbanward yet it cannot be overlooked that a full third of all of Colombia's migratory movements were towards rural areas. As a result of the cumulative massive flow of migrants over the years, half of Bogotá's population and two-fifths of that of other urban areas was made up of migrants as of 1964 census data. Moreover, as a consequence of a constant accumulative inflow of migrants through the years, some 75 per cent

Table 21

COMPARISON OF RECENT MIGRANTS AND RESIDENTS IN TERMS OF THEIR PERCENTAGE
OF 10 AND OVER POPULATION IN MARGINAL ACTIVITIES, BY SEX AND DESTINATION

| | Destination | | | | | |
| Sex | Capital | | Other urban areas | | Rural areas | |
	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents	Migrants	Residents
Male						
Self-employed	6.1	7.7	9.3	12.9	13.0	23.8
Unpaid family workers	0.2	0.0	0.7	1.3	6.4	12.6
Domestics	1.0	0.3	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.3
Total	7.3	8.0	10.9	14.7	19.9	36.7
Female						
Self-employed	1.3	2.3	1.9	3.1	0.1	2.9
Unpaid family workers	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	1.1
Domestics	26.0	8.0	14.9	5.5	0.7	2.1
Total	27.4	10.4	16.9	8.8	0.8	6.1

Source: OMUECE, tables 8 and 26.

of Bogotá's 30 and over population is made up of migrants, as is 60 per cent
of the 30 and over population of other urban areas. Yet, even in rural areas,
the effects of migration are not to be overlooked since two-fifths of Colombia's
rural population is also composed of migrants.

Judging from available data, the movement of people in Colombia appears
to be accelerating; indeed, the duration of residence data would indicate two-
fifths of the country's six and a half million migrants moved within the five year
period preceding the 1964 census. This conclusion has to be regarded cautiously,
however, due to certain idiosyncracies in this particular source of data.

The age-sex composition of Colombia's migrants exhibits patterns in
conformity with those which could be expected on the basis of the examination
of other Latin American migration flow. Thus it is that migration streams to
Bogotá and other urban areas include a disproportionate amount of women and
young people; migratory movements to rural areas again include a substantial
segment of young people but there the similarity ends since men make up the
majority of all rural migrants.

Investigation of the comparative marital status of migrants and residents
showed that unmarried people are most likely to migrate. With the exception of
female migrants to rural areas (who it may be surmised generally accompany their
husbands), migrants of all age-sex cohorts and to all destinations, whether
moving short or long distances, tend to have a significantly higher percentage
of single people than the corresponding categories of residents.

In short, judging on the basis of these demographic characteristics alone,
one might well conclude that migrants are disproportionately selected from the
more physically-vigorous and unattached elements of the population. Hence, it
could be postulated that migrants would be singularly well-equipped, in
quantitative and physical terms at least, to participate fully in the economic
processes of their destination areas. Whether or not migrants are qualitatively
capable of such participation, however, is another matter and one which was
broached from several related standpoints.

In terms of literacy and education, the migrants going to Bogotá hold a
substantial edge over those heading towards other urban areas and an even greater
advantage over those destined to rural areas. Nevertheless, because of the
differing educational standards of their respective receiving areas, the best-
educated migrants (i.e., those going to Bogotá) have an aggregate educational

level inferior to residents of the capital; migrants and residents of other urban areas have approximately the same level of general education while the least-educated migrants (those to rural areas) actually have a noticeable advantage over other rural residents.

How are these educational differences reflected in the employment structure of receiving areas? First of all, it is of some significance that recent migrants in Bogotá, other urban areas and rural areas have a sizeable advantage over residents in terms of their participation in economic activities. Yet, closer scrutiny of this differential reveals that the migrants' advantage is systematically concentrated into two categories - the 10-19 males and, females of all age groups. This would suggest that the higher activity rates of migrants are, in some aspects, dysfunctional, since it can be interpreted in the direction of a lesser proportion of young male migrants in school as well as a lesser proportion of unemployed housewives.

To present a coherent summary of the manner in which migrants and residents are distributed throughout the occupational hierarchy, it becomes necessary to focus separately on males and females in each of the destination areas.

Male migrants to Bogotá are unquestionably the best prepared of all migrants and obtain the most favourable job adaptation. Nevertheless their employment situation is generally inferior to that of the resident population. For instance, they have a somewhat lower proportion of their economically-active numbers employed in non-manual occupations than do residents. They also have a higher proportion in the lower-status employee category and in service activities. Hence, although the differences between male migrants and residents of Bogotá are small, they consistently show migrants to be situated at a somewhat lower level than residents in the occupational hierarchy. This inferiority, however, does not carry through to the marginal sector since residents actually have slightly more of their numbers in this lowest status group.

In other urban areas of Colombia, the occupational comparison of male migrants and residents is practically at a standoff. On the one hand, migrants do have a higher proportion in the lower status employee category and in service activities, but to balance this also have a higher proportion in non-manual activities and a substantially smaller percentage in economically-marginal activities.

As concerns rural areas, it would appear that male migrants enjoy a
consistent edge over residents: the former have a higher ratio in non-manual
occupations, and a considerably smaller proportion in marginal activities.
True, migrants do have a higher percentage of employees than residents but
this is offset by a lower proportion in unremunerated family activities.
Moreover, when branch of economic activity is considered, it is found that the
migrants' occupations tend to be more diversified although both groups
understandably have their largest proportions in agriculture.

Hence, it would appear that when compared to male residents at their
destination, rural migrants are best off, urban migrants enjoy a comparable
situation to that of residents and Bogotá's migrants are in the least favourable
situation. It should be emphasized, however, that these are relative terms and
that the clearest hierarchy visible exists at the level of comparison between
various migrant groups. Indeed, when the migrant groups are compared amongst
themselves, male migrants to Bogotá enjoy a privileged situation consequent upon
a superior educational background; similarly, urban migrants hold a considerable
advantage over the corresponding cohorts of rural migrants.

Looking now at the occupational distribution of female migrants, it is
evident that, even if we consider only the economically-active population,
women who migrate to Bogotá or to other urban areas, experience an employment
situation which suffers by comparison both to that of male migrants and to that
of resident females.

The main identifying characteristic of migrant women's employment in Bogotá
and other urban areas is their domination of the services sector. This phenomenon
in turn can literally be interpreted as a higher rate of employment in domestic
services; unmarried females, whether or not they specifically come to the towns
and cities in search of jobs as maids, are very likely to find themselves in this
position rather soon after arrival. As a result of this channelling process,
female migrants to these areas have a higher percentage in manual activities and
in the employees category than do residents. In addition, since domestic service
was classified in the current paradigm as an economically-marginal activity,
women migrants obviously hold a large edge in this category also.

The occupational distribution of women migrants to rural areas also suffers by comparison to that of their male counterparts; when viewed in connection with female residents, their situation is somewhat ambiguous but again dominated by the high proportion of migrant women who obtain employment as domestic servants.

Viewed in conjunction, the present data therefore suggest that a natural funnelling of the better-equipped male migrants to the more economically-attractive destinations takes place in Colombia. The best-educated migrants evidently head towards the capital city and obtain the most favourable employment of any migrant group. Lesser towns and cities attract a somewhat less-educated group who are nevertheless capable of obtaining a level of employment on a par with that of residents. Were we able to control for size of city, it is possible that a regular gradient in the training-employment complex characterizing various size-class cities would be uncovered. The least-educated migrants head towards rural areas but, on the aggregate level, are likely to exhibit a higher education and a superior occupational situation than residents of these zones.

It is also obvious from this investigation that female migrants to any of the three destinations are the least-trained and least productive of all migrant groups. However, the problem cannot be envisaged from the rather narrow standpoint of economic productivity since it is evident that if these women draw up their roots and migrate in search of employment as domestic servants then this life is being subjectively evaluated as preferable to that prevailing in their home area. Moreover, the situation is unlikely to change until pervasive modifications are effected in the encompassing socio-economic framework permitting this type of migrant to receive a better education and obtain more productive employment.

Appendix

OVERVIEW OF OMUECE MIGRATION DATA

Having conducted a trial analysis of migration in one country utilizing OMUECE sample data, a critical evaluation and general overview of the advantages and shortcomings of this source might be in order.

I.   Advantages

1) One of the most positive features of OMUECE lies in the fact that, normally, the data can be obtained within a relatively short time after a given census has been carried out. Processing small samples from national data and focusing on specific questions, the data bank is in a position to furnish results before regular census publications become available. (For instance, in Brazil, where available national information on migration dates back to 1950, OMUECE could furnish data based on a sample of 900,000 cases from the 1960 census at a low cost. Unfortunately, these moderate tabulation costs have nevertheless retarded use of this valuable material.)

2) The OMUECE migration section contains several valuable tables which do not normally appear in regular census publications. The very fact that direct comparisons can be made between migrants and residents on several variables is highly positive since the dearth of information on migration differentials is widely decried. This type of comparison can only be carried out within the context of local sample surveys. In addition, the variables on which direct comparisons can be established have been judiciously selected among the more crucial indices of migrant adjustment to life at their destination: age-sex composition, marital status, literacy, education, occupation, economic activity and marginal activity. Other indicators such as income and housing could be contemplated in order to complete the set.

3) The tables mentioned in the preceding paragraph are available for three main zones of migration - the capital, other urban areas and rural areas = thereby permitting comparison of the composition of migratory movements to each of these three broad groups of destination.

4) The majority of the comparisons between migrants and residents which can be affected use recent migrants (i.e., those who have arrived in the five years preceding the census date) as baseline. Consequently, it can be assumed

that if there do exist relevant demographic and socio-economic differences
between migrants and non-migrants, these will naturally become most evident
in the comparisons referring back to the least-assimilated recent migrants.

5) Since the OMUECE tabulations are standardized, it should be possible
to carry out the same plan of analysis for various countries thereby obtaining
valuable international comparisons on volume and differentials of migration flow.

6) Providing that the same format of tabulations is maintained for the
1970 censuses, further analyses could be carried out not only across countries
but over time as well. Moreover, such analyses could again be formulated before
regular census publications become available.

7) Should the researcher require additional information or cross-
tabulations, these can be made available to him at a modicum cost.

II. Limitations of OMUECE data

By definition, the OMUECE tabulations are based on relatively small samples
from national population censuses. While this approach carries with it the
considerable advantages noted earlier, it also presents the researcher with
several problems, the nature of which are more or less serious depending upon
the researcher's objectives. The aim of the following comments is that of
expliciting some of these difficulties and suggesting some alternative strategies
where feasible.

1) With reference to volume of migration, the OMUECE data present two
possible measures - residual lifetime migration and duration of residence data.
The former, by nature, provides no information concerning the time of movement,
except that it must have occurred during the lifetime of surviving migrants;
consequently these data are not comparable to the most widely-used measures of
migration relating to decennial intercensal periods. The other available
information, based on duration of residence data, is seriously jeopardized
in the case of Colombia by systematic tabulating or coding errors. Consequently,
the investigation of migration volume in Colombia had to be abbreviated and
incomplete in the present study.

2) The OMUECE data on migration are deprived of much of their potential
utility by the fact that they do not provide information on direction or streams
of migration. True, the data are broken down into three main categories according
to the destination of migrants-capital, other urban areas and rural areas.

However, each of these blocs of migrants is bound to be constituted by widely-variegated sub-groups according to origin, period, etc., and hence in the resulting overview, significant differences are bound to be obfuscated.

For purposes of illustration, if one considers the case of Brazil and migrations to such urban-industrial centers of attraction as Río de Janeiro and Sao Paulo, then it can be demonstrated that migrants from the North and Northeast differ radically in terms of composition and adaptability from those arriving from the more privileged Southern states. In Colombia itself, it has been shown that, for example, migrants to Bogotá from the contiguous mountain area tend to enter the occupational structure at lower levels than do migrants from distant departments.[33]

Under the present format, it is impossible to determine:

a) where the majority of the migrants to each of the three destination areas originate.

b) whether they are predominantly rural to urban or urban to urban migrants;

c) whether migrants from one area are more easily inserted into the occupational hierarchy than others.

d) whether particular age-sex cohorts predominate in out-migrations from or to given regions.

e) how distance and intervening opportunities affect migratory patterns.

Yet, without answering at least some of these questions and without being able to compare situations at origin and destination it is clear that no objective judgment can be formed on the validity of the migration process in a given area and hence, the possibility of formulating any sort of rational migration policy becomes all the more remote.

3) The manner in which tabulations have been programmed, permitting comparisons between recent migrants and all other residents, is a laudable first step. Nevertheless, it is unfortunate that non-recent migrants, i.e., those who arrived at the destination areas before the five-year period preceding the census date, have to be lumped together in the same category with the native residents of these destination areas. Analyses of migration differentials are seriously jeopardized as a result of this grouping since several factors may serve to adulterate or at least minimize differences between migrants and non-migrants.

---

[33] Cf. Simmons and Cardona (op. cit.).

For instance, it can be visualized that depending on the political, socio-economic or demographic context, significant differences would be found in the various waves of migrants coming into Bogotá during different periods. But even in the absence of such cyclical changes, the very fact that previous migrants are grouped in with natives, mitigates against the utility of resulting comparisons between migrants and residents. Indeed, the basic hypothesis underlying the study of migrant adjustment or assimilation postulates a gradual change over time as migrants become more familiar with the opportunities, means, norms and values of their destination area.

To attenuate this limitation, one would appreciate the inclusion of at least one more migrant group for comparative purposes. For instance, the comparison might be effected between: migrants with less than five years of residence, migrants with five to ten years' residence, and, all other residents. Or it might be carried out between - recent migrants, all other migrants, and, natives.

4) It could also be recommended that the absolute figures in CMUECE tabulations be accompanied by corresponding percentage figures. During the computerized tabulation process, adding in an extra column for percentage figures can be accomplished with little added expenditure of time and money. However, when the same calculations have to be performed posteriorly on a desk calculator, many long hours are unnecessarily wasted. This statement is particularly valid in the present context where extenuating calculations have to be performed in order to obtain a valid comparison between residents and recent migrants (i.e., in order to perform this comparison, recent migrants have to be subtracted out from each corresponding group of the total population (1st. generation tables) before percentage figures are computed).

5) Some minor adjustments could profitably be made in the organization of tables. For instance, the foreign-born population is included in tabulations of residual lifetime migration and duration of residence tables but are thereafter eliminated; it might be worthwhile considering eliminating these completely or including them in all tabulations. Secondly, the data on literacy and educational attainment are available only for the economically-active population aged 10 and over; they would obviously be more fruitful if extended to the entire 10 and over population, regardless of economic activity.

Thirdly, one of the more original and valuable tables set up by OMUECE
- that relating to proportion in marginal activities - is unavailable in the
first generation set of tables, except on a nation-wide basis. That is, data
on the number of persons engaged in marginal activities is available for
migrants by destination, sex and literacy but unavailable for the resident
population of Bogotá, other urban areas and rural areas. (Moreover, the one
table which was set up for all residents of Colombia, table 14, uses a different
coding procedure than that used for migrants in table 26.) True, the data on
marginal activity can be reconstituted for residents by selecting items in
table 8 but in addition to being time-consuming, this approach eliminates the
possibility of comparison on the sex and literacy variables.

Lastly, with respect to volume of migration, the duration of residence
by previous place of residence data are unfortunately not tabulated by sex and
hence lose considerable information.

6) Finally, perhaps the most serious shortcoming of OMUECE data at the
present stage of their development is one which is beyond the control of the
project's organizers. In light of the wholistic character of the migration
data in OMUECE, referring to groups of migrants headed to three broad groups
of areas and to comparisons of recent migrants with residents, this information
cannot easily be integrated with existing studies of migration because of
differences in the basic units of analysis. The inherent value of the OMUECE
migration data would therefore appear to lie in the direction of standardized
inter-country comparisons rather than of intensive analyses of phenomena in
individual countries.

Unfortunately, however, the data are only available for four countries
at the present time - Colombia, Ecuador, Panamá and Costa Rica. For the remaining
countries, sample data from the respective censuses are either unavailable,
defective, or else cannot be tabulated for lack of funds. Meanwhile, the four
countries for which sample data are available cannot objectively be described
as particularly typical or important, nor is there any reason to suggest that
migration phenomena in these countries would be especially insightful.
Consequently, it would appear that little would be gained by extending the
present analysis to the other countries for which data are available.

Given the aforementioned specific advantages of the CMUECE migration tabulations and the nature of the problems which they incorporate, it would appear that one fruitful avenue which these tabulations could take in the future (for instance, with the 1970 round of censuses and perhaps as a complement to the current project), would be to concentrate on selected countries, draw a larger sample from these and present more detailed information, the need for which was detailed above.