DEMOGRAPHY© Volume 13, Number 4 November 1976

FACETS OF REDISTRIBUTION: RESEARCH CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES*

Sidney Goldstein
Population Studies and Training Center, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island 02912

Within the last few years, we have passed three demographic milestones which have great significance not only for the remainder of this century but probably for the next century as well. Since the last annual meeting of the Population Association of America, the total population of the world passed the 4 billion mark, after reaching 3 billion just 15 years earlier; it will probably reach 5 billion within another 13 years.

A second milestone concerns the distribution of the population. Until 1975, a majority of the world's urban population was located in what the United Nations has designated as the more developed regions. This past year, however, if United Nations (1975b) estimates are correct, the balance shifted. For the first time, a majority of the world's urban population dwell in the less developed nations. Moreover, this change is expected to become substantially accentuated. Between 1950 and 2000, the urban population in the less developed nations is expected to experience an eight-fold increase, compared to an increase of only 2.5 in the more developed countries. As a result, by the year 2000 almost two-thirds of the world's three billion urban population will live in the less developed world, compared to only one-third at mid-century.

But the shift in urban balance extends beyond population; it also involves the distribution of cities. Whether judged by cities of 100,000 and over or of a million and over, the less developed countries now for the first time contain a majority of the world's cities. Whereas only 23 of the world's 71 million-plus cities were located in less developed nations at mid-century, just over half of the 181 cities now are, and by the year 2000 it is estimated that 264 of the projected 414 such cities will be in less developed countries (United Nations, 1975c). This past year marks the transition, therefore, in the relative distribution between the more and less developed nations of both the urban population and the number of cities.

Still a third development has manifested itself—a dramatic reversal in the patterns of population redistribution in the United States as well as in other more developed countries. After many decades during which people migrated first into the cities and then into adjoining suburbs, the rural areas and smaller cities now show signs of faster growth than do big cities and their suburbs. The 1960s were characterized by movement toward metropolitan areas of the United States but away from the core cities (Beale, 1975), an unprecedented number of which lost population; in the 1970s, however, not only the central cities but a growing number of metropolitan areas as a whole have begun to lose population. Between 1970 and 1974, 8 out of the 15 largest metropolitan areas in the United States had declined in population (Morrison, 1975; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1976). Whereas, in the 1960s, nonmetropolitan areas averaged migration losses of 300,000 per year to metropolitan areas, during the first years of the 1970s nonmetropolitan areas gained 350,000 persons annually. Nor is this development

* Presented as a Presidential address to the Population Association of America at its annual meeting in Montreal, Canada, April 1976. Dedicated to Dorothy Swaine Thomas.

unique to the United States. The European (Befolkningens Bevaegelser 1973, 1975) and Japanese (Kuroda, 1975) experiences also point to a substantial change in population redistribution patterns, involving a reversal in the basic pattern of rural to urban and/or nonmetropolitan to metropolitan internal migration. A new emphasis on quality of life as opposed to more strictly economic considerations seems to be assuming increasing importance as a motivation both in the decision to move and in the choice of residence (Elgin et al., 1974).

These three developments, then, must be seen as part of a complex set of developments which presents us with new research challenges and opportunities:

1. rapid population growth, especially in the less developed world;

2. sharp increases in the size of the urban population, in the level of urbanization, and in the number of cities, especially big cities, in the less developed nations; and

3. dramatic reversals in population redistribution patterns in many of the more developed countries.

Taken together, these developments point to a growing need for attention to population movement as a key component in population dynamics. In the more developed nations, as vital rates, and especially fertility, become more homogeneous between regions and between urban and rural places, migration takes on increased importance in accounting for differential growth rates and for changes in the composition of population between areas (National Center for Health Statistics, 1970). In less developed countries, migration also accounts for a disproportional share of the differential growth rate of urban and rural places; and in those locations where urban and rural fertility are still very similar, it accounts for almost all of the differential (United Nations, n.d.).

The importance of migration as a component of population change is attested to by the magnitude of the number of persons involved. On a worldwide basis, the most reasonable statistic we have is the United Nations' estimate that, during 1970–1975, a net transfer of about 100 million persons from rural to urban residence took place (United Nations, n.d.). But this is a net figure. Implicit in its size is the much larger gross movement which must have taken place. In the United States alone, 33 million persons were living in a different county in 1975 than in 1970 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1975). In contrast, during this same interval, about 17 million births and 10 million deaths occurred in the United States. Although the role of population movement in the overall dynamics of population change is obviously very different from that of births and deaths, the movement of such large numbers illustrates the acute need for concern with redistribution as an aspect of demographic change.

Whereas the study of fertility dominated demographic research in the past several decades, migration may well become the most important branch of demography in the last quarter of the century. Certainly, in many of the more developed countries, the achievement of low levels of fertility seems to be occurring simultaneously with maintenance of high levels of migration. Concomitantly with this situation, however, the less developed countries are experiencing massive flows of migrants into their cities while high fertility levels persist. Although the more and the less developed regions reflect very different combinations of migration and fertility patterns, it is clear that full evaluation of the dynamics of population change cannot rest on attention to one factor alone but must focus as well on the interaction between them.

The importance of migration as a component of population change has significance beyond its impact on the changing population size and composition of major regions, political subdivisions, and rural-urban places. Most, if not all, of the great social problems confronting both the more and the less developed countries to-

day probably have a migration component. Indeed, the general concern with the world's social situation focuses heavily on the interrelated vertical and horizontal aspects of distribution inequalities (cf. United Nations Economic and Social Council, 1974), the former related to the wide disparities in the levels of living and quality of life and the latter to the increasing concentration of population in urban places and especially the rapid growth of big cities in the less developed countries.

Actual or perceived disparities in economic opportunity and in social and cultural amenities between rural and urban places have been major determinants of the rural to urban shift in population. To the extent that such migration is not fully justified by economic development, it perpetuates massive urban poverty in the midst of those locations which are also the economic, cultural, social, political, and usually most modern centers of their nations. To compound this situation in the less developed world, the rate of growth of the rural population remains high. Despite substantial rural to urban migration, the rural population continues to increase and to constitute a significant percentage of the total population; and much of the rural population continues to be characterized by extreme poverty. Therefore, where the critical problems of cities reflect the even more serious problems in rural areas, anyone concerned with rural-urban migration and with urbanization must also give concerted attention to rural population and development. Otherwise, efforts to solve the problems of one of these may actually exacerbate the difficulties of the other and lead to still greater movement.

The close interrelations between migration and other demographic and social aspects of behavior underline the potential role of migration in producing greater homogenization in more developed countries and greater modernization in less developed areas. Migrants may well serve as agents of social change and as diffusers of cultural values and norms, contributing thereby to the breakdown of differences among regions and among cities, smaller towns, and rural areas—for better or for worse, effecting a more homogeneous national community and the spread of urban and modern values to less developed locations. Although continued heavy rural to urban migration in the less developed nations often creates a dualism in the cities which tends to perpetuate many of the values, traditions, and activities associated with rural life, increasing population interchanges and contacts between urban and rural places may also help to introduce social change and urban values and behavior to even the most isolated rural areas.

Within this general context, one may indeed ask whether migration has possibly already played a key role within the more developed world in the homogenization of fertility values and behavior; and whether in the decades ahead migration may also act as an agent of fertility change in the less developed world, as migrants from urban centers bring with them to the rural areas knowledge, attitudes, and personal behavior associated with lower fertility as part of other urban values and behavior traits (Zarate and Zarate, 1975). Attention to the interrelations between migration on the one hand and nuptiality and reproduction patterns on the other, and the implications of such interrelations for policy provides a unique opportunity for integrated research, especially when pursued within the broader context of urbanization and modernization and from a multidisciplinary perspective (Davis, 1963; Friedlander, 1969).

Changing Priorities and Perspectives

In 1960, Dudley Kirk (1960) concluded that the study of internal migration was the stepchild of demography, that there had been too little attention given to the theory and measurement of migration despite its role as the chief determinant of differences in population change and structure among local populations and, indeed, for many states. Almost ten years

later, the same theme was echoed by Donald Bogue (1969, p. 752) when he observed, "Some of the most acute social problems of the world today are associated with migration. If the problem of human fertility were not so critical at the present time, it is almost certain that human migration and the plight of migrants (especially in the developing nations) would be listed as a top priority problem for research and action." Expecially now, given its important role in population dynamics in both the more and less developed regions, we cannot afford not to give migration the high priority it should have received decades ago.

The recency and marginality of our concern with migration is illustrated very well by the American situation. Only since 1940 has a direct question on population movement been included in the U.S. federal census and the Current Population Survey. (For a fuller discussion of available U.S. data, see Shryock and Siegel, 1971.) The data collected since then provide information on the volume, direction, and characteristics of population movement in the United States, but they do not permit analysis of the complete migration experience of individuals, of many of the relevant characteristics before or after migration, or of the social-psychological aspects of population movement.

Alternate sources, such as the continuous work-history samples for social security records, overcome some of these limitations but still have many problems of their own (Hirschberg, 1975). The data are somewhat better in a number of countries where migration information is collected as part of their population registers. Yet of the 65 countries which maintain population registers, only 22 actually provide data on internal migration; and in many instances the information collected is not tabulated or available for research and policy purposes (United Nations, 1969).

The situation in less developed countries is particularly serious. Although some have begun to collect migration information as part of their census programs, the use of such information for analytic purposes, and particularly for the assessment of urban growth and urbanization, is severely restricted by the limited number and kinds of tabulations made and especially the frequent neglect of rural-urban population interchange (Elizaga, 1972; Goldstein and Sly, 1975a and 1975b; United Nations, 1974a). Some of these deficiencies have been overcome by specialized surveys focusing on migration (e.g., Balan et al., 1973; Caldwell, 1969; Goldstein et al., 1974; Macisco, 1975; Speare, 1973), but most of these surveys focus on small areas or individual communities, particularly big cities, restricting their value for purposes of generalization. Beyond this, they often seriously neglect major segments of the population essential to the full evaluation of the migration process—those who have moved about in rural areas, those who have returned to rural areas from urban settings, and especially those who have not moved at all.

In the absence of adequate direct census statistics on migration, much of our understanding of population movement has had to depend on direct estimates using a wide variety of techniques, most of which yield information on the volume of net migration, sometimes by such selected characteristics as age and sex (Goldstein and Sly, 1975b; Shryock and Siegel, 1971; United Nations, 1970). Yet the fact is that neither you nor I have ever seen the mysterious net migrant. Our estimates of the number of net migrants, while better than no information at all, yield only limited insights into what the migration process is all about. We need to know much more about the magnitude of the opposing streams of movement, the extent of circulatory movement, and the selective character and impact of movement on places of origin and destination. We must also analyze the relation between the in- and out-movement and success or failure in the achievement of individual goals and of a better adjustment on the societal level between population and resources.

Furthermore, we need to know to what

extent migration is complemented by still another type of movement—commuting. All too often commuting has been regarded as a phenomenon common only in the more developed world; yet there is some evidence to suggest that it is becoming increasingly prevalent in less developed countries (Liu and Speare, 1973). Indeed, the slowdown in the growth of some large cities in the less developed world, such as Bombay, may be partly explained by greater reliance on commuting (Zachariah, 1966). It can enable village residents to take advantage of the opportunities in nearby urban settings, while maintaining close ties to their families and their village (Hugo, 1975). It seems likely, therefore, that, as the problems associated with urban residence exacerbate and as the opportunities for employment in nonagricultural activities expand, commuting will increase. As important as it may be, however, to assess the role of commuting both in more and in less developed countries, all too often the necessary journey-to-work data are completely absent from censuses and surveys (United Nations, 1974a).

Given the shortcomings in our migration and commuting data, is it any wonder, then, that we are surprised when basic patterns seem to change? Can you imagine how much less understanding we would have of growth if our generalizations and insights were restricted to knowledge based on natural increase rather than on analyses of separate birth and death rates? Although the situation is not completely analagous, that is what we are often forced to do when we rely for our understanding of redistribution upon those mythical characters, the net migrants, overlooking both the separate in- and outmigration streams and the other forms of population movement, such as commuting. Can you imagine, too, undertaking a comprehensive study of fertility without giving any attention to those couples who have decided to remain childless or those couples who have decided to halt their fertility? How different is it when, in migration studies, we focus our attention entirely on those who migrate, ignoring the great masses of population in the less developed regions and a considerable portion of those in the more developed countries who do not move or who commute? Why is it that, despite all the emphasis on pregnancy histories and cohort analysis in fertility research, we are forced to rely heavily on period-type data in combination with net migration estimates for information on population movements? In so doing, we forego the opportunity to utilize migration histories to assess the extent of repeat migration, the spacing of moves, and the relation of movement to changes in other social and economic characteristics as people move through the life cycle. Given such data deficiencies, how can we expect to assess the true role of population movement in the growth and decline of cities and metropolitan areas and the real impact of development efforts on such growth patterns? On a still more general level, in the absence of equally good and comprehensive data for fertility, mortality, and migration, how can we expect to assess fully the interrelations among these three components as they respond jointly to changing conditions and to each other?

Yet even the most comprehensive data will yield only limited results without extensive rethinking of our basic concepts of migration. Although we have undoubtedly gone well beyond Ravenstein's efforts in the 1880s to establish migration laws (Goldscheider, 1971, pp. 48–75; Kosinski and Prothero, 1974; Lee, 1966; Mabogunje, 1970; Petersen, 1958; Shaw, 1975; Zelinsky, 1971), comprehensive theories and models of migration are still lacking for a number of reasons (Speare, Goldstein, and Frey, 1975):

1. There are serious doubts about the possibility of devising a general theory that has equal validity for both the more and less developed regions (Pryor, 1975a);

2. it is difficult to relate aggregate models, which are useful for predicting the volume of migration streams, to individual models, which attempt to explain why people move;

3. attention must be given to both structural and social-psychological components (Pryor, 1975b); and

4. perhaps, above all, adequate data are lacking with which to test fully the theories and models that have been formulated.

Although it is tempting to do so, we must be particularly careful not to generalize too freely to the less developed countries the migration and urbanization experience of the more developed regions. As in other areas of demographic concern, there seems little firm basis for believing that migration patterns in the less developed countries will follow the same path as those experienced by the more developed. Indeed, the surprising recent changes in redistribution patterns in the more developed countries raise doubts about the validity of past models for the future experience of even the more developed regions (Beale, 1975). The limited evidence from the less developed areas (e.g., Hugo, 1975) indicates that, both for historical reasons and because sociocultural factors overlie economic pressures, the patterns of movement there may be very different from what might be expected given the level of modernization and development. Such countries may experience much more circulatory movement, may witness the operation of considerable urban as well as rural push factors, and may resort to a heavier reliance on commuting at a much earlier stage of development. The norms which influence the form and volume of movement will vary considerably depending on the social, economic, technical, and political circumstances of the community over time and space (Pryor, 1975b).

As a result, it may, in fact, not be possible to devise an adequate general typology; what may be more useful are special purpose typologies. In the more developed world, distance, time, motives, and adjustment all probably have a very different significance now than they had just several decades ago; even more important, they are operating differently in the less developed areas than they did in the more developed regions at comparable levels of development. Such a situation calls not only for a reexamination of basic concepts and their significance, but also for broader, better, and more frequent data on movement. Among the greatest faults of which we are guilty in migration research is being locked into the same kinds of questions related to the same concepts of migration that were developed years ago for a particular setting at a particular time. This may well help to explain why we are so surprised at what is happening in the more developed world; it may go far in explaining why we know so little about population movement elsewhere.

Facets of Redistribution Reconsidered

What are some of the directions in which we should consider changing our thinking and priorities? One of our first considerations must be improved sources of data. We must continue to include direct questions on migration in censuses and other major national surveys and to expand the number of countries in which these questions are asked. Such questions and the tabulations based on them must focus, however, on the types of movement that are of most pressing concern, theoretically and substantively, not just those which have been asked about traditionally (cf. Drury, 1971). For example, to measure migration in the less developed world in terms of population movement between provinces, neglecting entirely movement between rural and urban areas, represents lost opportunities. But inclusion in census surveys of two or three questions on migration and possibly a question on journey to work can only begin to provide the information needed to undertake meaningful assessments of migration. Migration statistics must be made a regular and full component of a system of population statistics (National Center for Health Statistics, 1970, pp. 15–24), especially if the interrelations of migration

with fertility are to be assessed. Every possible effort must be made to incorporate greater attention to migration as part of any data collection effort directed at measuring population dynamics, including even those whose major focus is on fertility. I find it difficult to understand the failure to give fuller attention to migration in such data collection efforts as the National Survey of Family Growth and the World Fertility Survey, and the failure to exploit more fully the migration data obtained in the varied population growth surveys in less developed countries (Linder and Lingner, 1975; Lunde, 1976; Marks et al., 1974).

As attractive as exploitation of censuses and general surveys, fertility surveys, and population growth studies may be for purposes of obtaining information on migration, comprehesive evaluation of migration patterns requires specialized surveys which focus primarily on migration. Because of the complex character of population movement, we need to explore the full array of the different forms of movement and the ways they relate to each other, to other aspects of population dynamics, and to the social and economic structure of the places of in- and outmovement. Most of our emphasis has been given to "permanent" migration, measured in terms of place of birth and place of earlier residence; in the process, we have overlooked a wide range of other types of movement. For example, we need to assess the prevalence of, and the conditions spawning, return or circular migration. Commuting and temporary residence in urban places, including seasonal migration, may also play an important role in the total pattern of adjustment between opportunities and movement. Both affect the places of origin and destination as well as the migrants and their families; and both may serve as important agents of social and individual change.

Among the most serious limitations of available information on migration is the dearth of data on premigration characteristics. This deficiency argues strongly for obtaining complete individual migration histories; these would permit much fuller assessment of the conditions of migrants both before and after the move and of the relation of one move to another. They would allow identification of those who are repeated or chronic movers and evaluation of the role of repeated migrants in the population growth of given localities as well as in the demographic, social, and political instability of locations. They would permit better assessment of adjustment problems, as well as measurement of changes in demographic behavior which follow migration, particularly in comparison to the behavior of persons who did not move. They would enable identification of changes in the form of movement and the conditions under which greater reliance is placed on permanent migration, commuting, or circulatory and repeat movement.

In addition, in-depth interviewing of nonmigrants as well as migrants should permit fuller understanding of what it is that makes an individual think of moving, what it is that eventually leads to a move, and why so many people do not, in fact, move at all (Goldscheider, 1971, pp. 48–75; Petersen, 1958; Uhlenberg, 1973). Particularly because of the huge reservoirs of population that are building up in the rural areas of the less developed world, it is essential to understand stability as well as mobility. Such information should prove useful for evaluating past and present migration as well as for improving our ability to predict future population movement, particularly at a time when such movement takes on increased importance as a factor in population growth and decline. Beyond this, it should also facilitate efforts designed to control movement—either in form, volume, direction, or selective character—as part of larger efforts to cope with the problems of urbanization, modernization, and development. Such a concern underscores the need to study not only movement to big cities in the less developed regions but that to smaller urban places and the rural areas as well. The

same need is apparent in the more developed areas where the back-to-earth movement, big-city-to-small-town movement, and reversals in regional movement beg for in-depth explanations.

Greater efforts should also be exerted to ascertain expected future mobility. We already have evidence to suggest that there is a strong relation between the wish to move and actual mobility (Mazie and Rawlings, 1972). As the increased migration to smaller towns and rural areas in the United States suggests, had we placed greater reliance on the expressions of preference indicated by respondents in surveys several years earlier (Beale, 1975), we would not have been so surprised at the changing migration patterns. In this case, preferences were translated into action, suggesting that research can help both to understand ongoing processes and to provide a firmer basis for predicting future movement.

Inherent in all these concerns is the need to "flesh out" the skeletal statistics provided by traditional census and survey questionnaires, so that we can understand more fully the dynamics of both movement and stability and have a firmer basis for projecting future trends. We know already from our experience with fertility studies how difficult a task it is to assess the social-psychological aspects of demographic behavior (Myers, 1975). Joint efforts to gain a better understanding of the motives for moving or not moving, and the motives for having or not having children, may well prove of mutual benefit to the more general understanding of demographic behavior.

Concurrently, in order to advance on both the theoretical and the applied levels, we must have comparative research on population movement, especially in relation to urbanization in preindustrial, industrial, and postindustrial settings. Only through such comparisons can we come to understand the varied forms which movement takes, depending on the large array of locational, developmental, and social factors, as well as on the previous types of urban hierarchies and the presence of policies designed to control population flow and urban growth. In all such efforts, we must avoid reliance upon outmoded and inappropriate concepts, questions, and measures, those whose sacredness stems only from the fact that they have been used in the past and most often in the more developed world.

Anticipating the Unanticipated

Despite the extensive research literature on demographic problems, planners and decision makers have made little use of it (International Conference on Population, Workshop 15, 1975). In part, this reflects the policy makers' failure to recognize the full value of research. In part, it may be the fault of demographers who have not focused enough on those issues which can most easily demonstrate the relevance of demographic research to problem solving. To communicate the evidence on the relation between fertility reduction and development may be difficult, but the role of migration in the mushrooming growth of cities of the less developed countries may be much easier to communicate, because the related problems are themselves so visible. In turn, successful use of demographic research on population movement as the basis for policy formulation and implementation might well facilitate the more general use of demographic research in problem solving. Moreover, focusing on migration as a high priority research area has the added advantage of demonstrating clearly to those engaged in policy making the close interrelations between rural and urban areas (Byerlee, 1974). By more fully assessing how the levels and characteristics of population movement produce or alleviate social and cultural inequality between rural and urban places and within each type of location, as well as how such movement is related to other components of population change in rural and urban areas, such research could serve an integrative function both for scientific and for policy purposes.

Individual governments as well as international agencies and research centers are increasingly recognizing that the growing metropolitan populations make the spa-

tial distribution of population an area of concern at least as important as the rate of growth (Miro, 1974; United Nations, 1974b and 1974c). Reflecting this, the World Population Plan of Action made a number of recommendations regarding rural development, migration, and population redistribution (United Nations, 1975a). However, the quality of our knowledge about the dynamics of population redistribution, and the success or failure of recent efforts to control migration and urban growth, cast doubt on whether we are yet able to make specific recommendations on how to control either.

Despite the plethora of expert opinions on how to cope with the problems associated with migration and urban growth and decline, the answers differ, largely because so much of the discussion takes place in the absence of relevant factual data. William Seltzer (1971, p. 55) stated it well in talking about environmental issues: "Free from the restraints of relevant data, the issues are 'resolved' . . . on the basis of piecemeal statistics of trivia, anecdotes, and speculations of doom or utopia. . . . If the future is to be less blind than the past, there is an urgent need for a systematic and extensive data collection on a wide range of environmental problems." How true this is of migration and urbanization! This is not to suggest that we should wait for the full facts before beginning to cope with the problems; it does emphasize, however, the need to proceed with caution, both before attributing cause and effect relationships and before making value judgments as to the worth of suggested solutions for particular situations.

Because a wide range of social, economic, and political developments can have an impact—sometimes directly, but more often indirectly—on population movement, it becomes crucial to be better able to anticipate the consequences of specific policies for population movement. This would permit both more accurate projections of the resulting levels, direction, and selective character of movements and more effective design of the programs to avoid undesirable migration consequences. As a first step, we need much fuller assessment of policies that have failed, as well as of those that have succeeded, and of their effect on migration and urbanization.

Unfortunately, both urban planning and programs designed to achieve economic and social development in rural areas are all too frequently done with limited attention to their impact on population, and especially population movement. For example, those who have stressed the contributions of the Green Revolution to increasing food supply have often failed to anticipate that the changes directed toward such goals, including expansion of holdings and the mechanization of the productive and distributive processes, could easily generate severe problems of unemployment in rural areas and, in turn, heavier rural exodus to cities, exacerbating the problems of urban places (Currie, 1975). Similarly, proposals are often made and implemented to develop rural areas through the construction of roads linking large cities to small towns and villages, without full anticipation of their potential consequences for population redistribution. Coupled with increasing literacy and widespread modern communications, such road construction does indeed make it easier for people living in the most isolated villages to benefit from development and modernization. All too often, however, planners overlook the fact that the roads which go from the city to the village also go from the village to the city, making it much easier for the villagers to leave and add to the problems of urban centers. In the more developed countries, too, we have been overly naive in failing to anticipate that the complex system of interstate highways and ring roads could contribute to a very significant alteration in migration and commuting patterns (Humphrey and Sell, 1975).

If our efforts to assess the role of population movement in population dynamics are to be comprehensive, encompassing not only past migration but future move-

ment, we must become more sensitive to the signals provided by our existing data and concurrently sharpen our perception of the implications of proposed programs by trying to anticipate what, all too often, have turned out to be unanticipated consequences for migration.

Overview

Although considerable progress has been made in the last few decades, the improvement in the quantity and quality of our information on population movement has not kept pace with the increasing significance of movement itself as a component of demographic change. Going beyond the statistics collected in standard census-type surveys, we urgently need a wide range of data which will permit us to relate our basic research on the volume, form, characteristics, and motivation for movement to the problems of urban and metropolitan growth and decline. Then we will be able to better understand migration as a part of the larger process of development and modernization. This is a challenge not only to those of us who have worked in migration but to the profession as a whole, for the different areas of demography must advance together. Concurrently, we must also benefit from the methods, perspectives, and insights provided by the other social sciences. Only then can we begin to understand how the various facets of redistribution relate to each other; how they relate to changing levels of fertility and mortality, and to population composition; and how they are affected by changes in social, economic, technological, and political conditions.

In particular, we must take advantage of every opportunity to incorporate attention to migration into all systematic efforts to collect data on the dynamics of population change, including the U.S. National Survey of Family Growth, KAP-type studies in other countries, and the World Fertility Survey. We must do so not only for the insights we shall obtain on migration itself, but also for the insights that will be provided on interrelations between migration and fertility and their joint effects on population growth and development. Beyond this, the multiplicity of questions raised by migration in both the more and the less developed regions and its key role in the development process argues strongly for the development of specialized national migration surveys. As far as feasible, these should be coordinated through the United Nations, CICRED (Comité International de Coordination des Recherches Nationales en Démographie), or the IUSSP (International Union for the Scientific Study of Population) to ensure maximum comparability of basic concepts and kinds of data collected. They should be conducted in countries in varied regions of the world, representing different levels of development and urbanization and characterized by different policies with respect to migration and urban growth. The comparative results obtained from a relatively small number of such studies should prove particularly valuable in providing a firmer basis for later considering the desirability either of a separate World Migration Survey or of integrating such a survey with the World Fertility Survey, if the latter should continue. This would provide the basis both for comprehensive assessment of all aspects of population movement and for evaluation of existing migration and urban growth policies and formulation of new ones.

These long-range, large-scale data collection goals should not blind us, however, to the continuing need to ensure maximum exploitation of existing data sources in censuses, ongoing surveys, population registers, and other administrative record systems, nor stop us from moving ahead in refining our concepts and developing our models and theories. Indeed, the latter must be a prerequisite to extensive data collection efforts. It is in these spheres in particular that our own PAA Committee on Population Statistics (COPS) can play a key role.

As redistribution proceeds in both the

more and the less developed regions, it provides us with new challenges to demonstrate our research ingenuity and new opportunities to apply our knowledge to help achieve realistic and effective development policies. The study of redistribution has suffered far too long from neglect within the profession, within government agencies responsible for data collection, within foundations and other groups responsible for funding research, and among those responsible for planning the future and anticipating the consequences of their plans for the welfare of their people. It behooves us to rectify this situation in this last quarter of the twentieth century, when redistribution in all of its facets will undoubtedly constitute a major, and increasingly important, component of demographic change as individuals and societies in both the more and the less developed nations continue their quest for greater equality and a satisfying life.

References

Balan, Jorge, H. L. Browning, and E. Jelin. 1973. Men in a Developing Society. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Beale, Calvin. 1975. The Revival of Population Growth in Nonmetropolitan America. ERS-605. Washington, D.C.: Economic Research Service, Department of Agriculture.

Befolkningens Bevaegelser, 1973 (Vital Statistics, 1973). 1975. Statistiske Meddelelser 9.

Bogue, Donald J. 1969. Principles of Demography. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Byerlee, D. 1974. Rural-Urban Migration in Africa—Theory, Policy, and Research Implications. International Migration Review 8:543–566.

Caldwell, John C. 1969. African Rural-Urban Migration. Canberra: Australian National University Press.

Currie, Laughlin. 1975. Urbanization: Some Basic Issues. A/Conf. 70/RPC/BP/1. New York: United Nations.

Davis, K. 1963. The Theory of Change and Response in Modern Demographic History. Population Index 29:345–366.

———. 1975. Asia's Cities: Problems and Options. Population and Development Review 1:71–86.

Drury, Robert F. 1971. An Information Base for National Population Policy. Unpublished report prepared for the U.S. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

Elgin, Duane, T. Thomas, T. Logothetti, and S. Cox. 1974. City Size and the Quality of Life. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Elizaga, J. C. 1972. Internal Migration: An Overview. International Migration Review 6:121–146.

Friedlander, D. 1969. Demographic Responses and Population Change. Demography 6:359–381.

Goldscheider, Calvin. 1971. Population, Modernization, and Social Structure. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Goldstein, Sidney, and D. F. Sly, eds. 1975a. Basic Data Needed for the Study of Urbanization. Liège: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.

———. 1975b. The Measurement of Urbanization and Projection of Urban Population. Liège: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.

———, V. Prachuabmoh, and A. Goldstein. 1974. Urban-Rural Migration Differentials in Thailand. Research Report No. 12. Bangkok: Institute of Population Studies.

Hirschberg, D. A. 1975. The Continuous Work-History Sample. Statistical Reporter 75-11:181–184.

Hugo, Graeme John. 1975. Population Mobility in West Java, Indonesia. Ph.D. dissertation. Canberra: The Australian National University.

Humphrey, C. R., and R. R. Sell. 1975. The Impact of Controlled Access Highways on Population Growth in Pennsylvanian Non-Metropolitan Communities, 1940–1970. Rural Sociology 40: 332–343.

International Conference on Population. Workshop 15. 1975. Urban Plans Must Build on Study of Population Trends. Population Dynamics Quarterly 3:5.

Kirk, D. 1960. Some Reflections on American Demography in the Nineteen Sixties. Population Index 26:305–310.

Kosinski, Leszek A., and R. M. Prothero, eds. 1974. People on the Move: Studies on Internal Migration. London: Methuen and Company.

Kuroda, Toshio. 1975. Urbanization and Population Redistribution in Japan. Unpublished manuscript.

Lee, E. S. 1966. A Theory of Migration. Demography 3:47–57.

Linder, Forrest E., and J. W. Lingner. 1975. Systems of Demographic Measurement, General Evaluation: The Measurement Problem. Scientific Report Series No. 22. Chapel Hill, N.C.: International Program of Laboratories for Population Statistics, University of North Carolina.

Liu, Paul K. C., and A. Speare, Jr. 1973. Urbanization and Labor Mobility in Taiwan. Paper presented at IUSSP International Population Conference, Liège.

Lunde, Anders S. 1976. Systems of Demographic Measurement, Data Collection Systems: The Single-Round Retrospective Interview Survey. Scientific Report Series No. 24. Chapel Hill, N.C.: International Program of Laboratories for Population Statistics, University of North Carolina.

Mabogunje, A. L. 1970. Systems Approach to a Theory of Rural-Urban Migration. Geographical Analysis 2:1–18.

Macisco, John J., Jr. 1975. Migrants to Metropolitan Lima. Santiago: Centro Latinoamericano de Demografía (CELADE).

Marks, Eli S., W. Seltzer, and K. J. Krotki. 1974. Population Growth Estimation: A Handbook of Vital Statistics Measurement. New York: The Population Council.

Mazie, S. M., and S. Rawlings. 1972. Public Attitude Towards Population Distribution Issues. Pp. 599–615 in U.S. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, Population Distribution and Policy, Research Report Five. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Miro, C. A. 1974. Interrelationship of Population Policy and Aspects of Development, Social Research Needed for Population Policy. Pp. 169–185 in the Ford Foundation (ed.), Social Science Research on Population and Development. New York: The Ford Foundation.

Morrison, Peter. 1975. The Current Demographic Context of National Growth and Development. Santa Monica, Calif.: The Rand Corporation.

Myers, G. C. 1975. Review of: Men in a Developing Society. Demography 12:387–394.

National Center for Health Statistics. 1968. Migration, Vital, and Health Statistics. Series 4, Number 9. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

———. 1970. Needs for National Studies of Population Dynamics. Series 4, Number 12. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Petersen, W. 1958. A General Typology of Migration. American Sociological Review 23:256–266.

Pryor, Robin J. 1975a. The Migrant to the City in South East Asia—Can, and Should We Generalize? Unpublished papers. Canberra: The Australian National University.

———, ed. 1975b. The Motivation of Migration. Studies in Migration and Urbanization No. 1. Canberra: Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University.

Seltzer, W. 1971. Environmental Issues. Concerned Demography 2:53–59.

Shaw, R. Paul. 1975. Migration Theory and Fact: A Review and Bibliography of Current Literature. Bibliography Series Number Five. Philadelphia: Regional Science Research Institute.

Shryock, Henry, J. S. Siegel, and Associates. 1971. The Methods and Materials of Demography. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Speare, A., Jr. 1973. The Determinants of Migration to a Major City in a Developing Country: Taichung, Taiwan. Pp. 167–188 in Institute of Economics (ed.), Essays on the Population of Taiwan. Taipei: Institute of Economics, Academia Sinica.

———, S. Goldstein, and W. H. Frey. 1975. Residential Mobility, Migration, and Metropolitan Change. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Uhlenberg, P. 1973. Noneconomic Determinants of Nonmigration: Sociological Considerations for Migration Theory. Rural Sociology 38:296–311.

United Nations. n.d. Population Distribution and Internal Migration. Unpublished manuscript.

———. 1969. Methodology and Evaluation of Population Registers and Similar Systems. ST/STAT/SER.F/15. New York: United Nations.

———. 1970. Methods of Measuring Internal Migration. ST/SOA/SeriesA/47. New York: United Nations.

———. 1974a. Handbook of Population and Housing Census Methods. Part IV: Survey of Population and Housing Census Experience, 1955–1964. ST/STAT/SER.F/16/Add. 4. New York: United Nations.

———. 1974b. Population Policies and Programmes. E/CONF.60/CBP/21. New York: United Nations.

———. 1974c. Report on the Second Inquiry Among Governments on Population and Development. E/CONF. 60/CBP/32. New York: United Nations.

———. 1975a. Report of the United National World Population Conference. E/CONF.60/19. New York: United Nations.

———. 1975b. Trends and Prospects in Urban and Rural Population, 1950–2000, as Assessed in 1973–1974. ESA/P/WP.54. New York: United Nations.

———. 1975c. Trends and Prospects in the Populations of Urban Agglomerates, 1950–2000, as Assessed in 1973–1975. ESA/P/WP.58. New York: United Nations.

United Nations Economic and Social Council. 1974. 1974 Report on the World Social Situation. Social Trends: A Global Overview. E/CN.5/512. New York: United Nations.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1975. Mobility of the Population of the United States, March 1970 to March 1975. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 285.

———. 1976. Estimates of the Population of Metropolitan Areas, 1973 and 1974, and Components of Change Since 1970. Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 618.

Zachariah, K. C. 1966. Bombay Migration Study: A Pilot Analysis of Migration to an Asian Metropolis. Demography 3:378–391.

Zarate, A., and A. Unger de Zarate. 1975. On the Reconciliation of Research Findings of Migrant-Nonmigrant Fertility Differentials in Urban Areas. International Migration Review 9:115–157.

Zelinsky, W. 1971. The Hypothesis of the Mobility Transition. Geographical Review 61:219–249.