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ABSTRACT

Living in a village is not a dream for the youngsters who prefer the lifestyle in town. For those villagers around Lundu District, the desire to move and enjoy the development at Kuching Town always dreamt by the youngsters. Furthermore, the situation gets difficult when they feel torn between continuing agriculture activity and the desire to live in town.

There were 3 villages in Lundu District selected as case study area to see the impact of agriculture and migration relationship. Kg Stunggang Melayu and Kg Stunggang Dayak were chosen as a model to measure the migration impact to farming activity that has been practiced for ages. While Kg Sempadi was chosen because of the variety in economy sector including involvement in agriculture sector. These 3 village are facing the difficulties to further their agriculture activity due to lack of cooperation from the youngsters to continue this tradition.

The result obtained from this study shows that limited job opportunity motivate the youngsters to move out from these area. They prefer to work in town rather than farming. Apart from that, migration also one of the strategy for them to obtained a better lifestyle especially economically.
ABSTRAK

Kehidupan di desa bukanlah satu impian d kalangan golongan mudah yang ghairahkan keriuhan kota. Bagi penduduk di sekitar daerah Lundu, keinginan untuk berpindah dan menikmati kepesatan pembangunan bandaraya Kuching sering menghantui golongan pemuda pemudinya. Tambahan pula, keadaan terseput di antara keperluan menyambung tradisi bertani dan keinginan sering mendorong mereka mengejar keihupan di bandar.

Tiga buah kampong di daerah Lundu telah dipilih sebagai kawasan kajian bagi melihat sejauhmana kesan pertanian dan migrasi saling berkait rapat. Kg Stunggang Melayu dan Kg Stunggang Dayak dijadikan model bagi mengukur kesan migrasi ke atas aktiviti bersawah padi yang telah di jalankan sejak berkurun lama. Manakala Kg Sempadi pula dipilih atas sebab kepelbagaian kegiatan ekonomi yang di amalkan termasuklah pengibatan dalam sektor pertanian. Ketiga-tiga kampong ini mempunyai masalah untuk meneruskan kegiatan pertanian akibat kurangnya golongan muda yang sudi bekerjasama menyambung tradisi tersebut.

Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa kekurangan peluang pekerjaan telah menyebabkan golongan muda lebih suka untuk berpindah keluar dari kawasan tersebut. Mereka lebih suka bekerja di bandar daripada membanting tulang bertani. Selain itu, migrasi juga merupakan salah satu strategi bagi golongan ini untuk mendapatkan kehidupan yang lebih baik, terutamanya dari segi ekonomi.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter will give an overview of the background information of migration in general; rural-urban migration, migration in Malaysia, problem statement, objectives of the study and study area.

1.1 Background of the Study

A study on migration is made to analyse the trend of migration’s flow for the community in the area of origin and the migration area. The study will involve the assessment on the development of both areas. The most common issues discussed in these areas are the migration’s flow between rural and urban areas (and vice versa). This is due to the fact that population distribution between urban and rural areas is accepted as one of the indicators to measure the structural differences in developing nation. Nearly half of the world’s populations live in the cities.

“Urban population growth in the developing world is far more rapid than population growth generally: about half of the urban growth is accounted for by migrants from the rural areas. Cities in the developing world are growing far more rapidly than those in developed countries.”


One of the main contexts, stressed in this study of rural urban migration is, ‘who is involved’. Those who involve in migration can be from all age group with different aims and objectives. The main factor behind the urge to migrate is related to the wish to improve livelihood. Rural people are very keen to migrate to town because of the expectation of better opportunities and standard of living the town can offer to them.

This particular study will determine the impact of rural-urban migration towards agricultural sector in three villages in Lundu, Sarawak. The concerns of this study include the impact of
migration to the society and activities in the villages. Normally, the impact can be seen clearly on
the families of the migrants, where they will indirectly experience the negative or positive impact
of this flow. For instance, those migrants who gained better livelihood after their movement
usually share it with their family who stayed back in the village. They will assist their family to
support financially or materially.

In this research, the case is not only limited to individual migrant that move out to find better job
or income. It also takes into account those children that move out in the short term for further
study. These children leave their hometown for further studies because the educational facilities
in their village are generally limited and inferior.

1.2 Rural-urban migration

The relationship between rural and urban is very obvious. Both are very dependent on each other.
Regardless of the differences between the developments flow in both areas; the intertwined
between them are very strong. Both urban and rural livelihoods have something in common, the
limited resources and unlimited needs. Therefore, the demand and supply are not stable if only
one side is emphasized. It is important that both side need to narrow the inequality gap between
demand and supply. Cecilia Tacoli (1998) in her article “Bridging The Divide: Rural-Urban
Interactions And Livelihood Strategies” divide the interaction between rural and urban into two;
linkages across space, and sectoral interaction. She tried to bring up the issues that influenced the
linkages between rural and urban and highlighted how positive rural-urban interactions and
backward and forward linkages between agricultural production, industry and services can foster
equitable development.

On the other hand, rural and urban also have their differences for example in the population
distribution. The distributions of population in rural and urban are unbalanced, especially in less
developed country or developing country. Population concentration is more in urban areas. The main process that contributes to these unbalanced is migration.

"Perhaps the most important structural deference between developed and less developed nations is the distribution of the population between rural and urban areas. Nearly half of the world’s population lives in cities. But by 2025, two-thirds will live in urban areas. Urban population growth in the developing world is far more rapid than population growth generally: about half the urban growth is accounted for by migrants from the rural areas. Cities in the developing world are growing far more rapidly than those in developed countries"


The trend of internal migration in Malaysia for example, shows that more people move to urban area than the other way round. This is confirmed by the report from Department of Statistic in 2001, where, out of 70.3 percent of urban migrant population, 51.7 percent of them are originally from urban area, either from the urban area in the same state or outside. Table 1 (a) below shows full data of percentage distribution of internal migration by its direction.

Table 1 (a)

Percentage Distribution of Internal Migrants by Migration Direction (Stratum),

Malaysia, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Migration Survey Report Malaysia 2001, Department of Statistics, Malaysia

Table 1 (b) above shows the breakdown of the percentage distribution by age group. From the data it is obvious that the highest rate of migration, which is 30.8 percent of the migrant, come from the age group 15-24 followed by age group 25 to 34. This is because this age group are the most economically active and the younger group may migrate to continue their study or to find job opportunities in the cities. Whereas those in age group 40 and above are more settled and tied to the community, thus they formed the lowest percentage in this rural-urban migration.
Table 1 (b)
Number and Percentage Distribution of Internal Migrants by Age Group, Malaysia 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>771352</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 14</td>
<td>194897</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24</td>
<td>237970</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>211193</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>85337</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>34378</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>7577</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Migration Survey Report Malaysia 2001, Department of Statistics, Malaysia

The same trend also happens in other areas in the world in accordance with the level of development.

According to the World Bank (1992), there have been an increase in the number of urban population in the ‘low and middle income countries’ from 557 million in 1965 to 1820 million in 1990, while the annual rate of growth rose from 3.7 percent between 1965 and 1980 to 6.6 percent in the 1980’s. Gugler 1988, in Boyle et. al, (1988) agreed that there’s no precedent on the pace of urban growth within the developing world as most of this growth stems from natural change. Boyle et.al also stressed that about two-fifth of this world population is fuelled by rural-urban migration. In his book, Boyle gave examples on many parts of the developing world that faced biases in urbanization process. In Sudan for instance, 8 percent of Sudanese lived in urban areas and this number increase to 20 percent by 1983.

1.3 Problem statement

Many young people move out from their villages when they reach certain age. Most of them prefer not to work in agricultural sector. They migrate to town either to look for a better job or to
pursue higher education. Another reason for migration is also to follow their partner, either husband or wife working or staying at other place.

This study will determine the impact of this migration on agriculture sector in these three villages. In Kampung Stunggang Melayu and Stunggang Dayak, the wet rice scheme that is implemented by DID (Drainage and Irrigation Department) are almost abandoned for more than a decades. Before the scheme was implemented, wet rice cultivation in both villages is the main source of income. Agricultural sector was very resourceful compare to other activities. When the scheme was first implemented, the participation is very vigorous. However, these participations were slowly declining after a few years of implementation. According to the farmers, this is due to shortage of manpower to work in the rice fields. The existing farmers are too old to continue working in the rice fields, while their children refused to take over their work. The same trend also happens in Kg Sempadi, where most of the people are involved in agriculture sector. Their main sources of income are from planting of black pepper and fruits trees, fishing and woodcutting.

1.4 Objectives of the study

The general objective of the study is to determine the impact of migration on the agricultural sector in Kampung Stunggang Melayu, Kampung Stunggang Dayak and Kampung Sempadi.

Specific Objectives:

The specific objectives of the study are:

1) to determine the rate of migration in Kampung Stunggang Melayu, Kampung Stunggang Dayak and Kampung Sempadi

2) to compare the impact of migration between Malay and Iban village in term of economic condition/standard of living, development and culture.
3) to find out the pattern of migration in this three villages;
   a. The reason for migration
   b. Type of migration: whether it is a permanent or temporary migration.
4) to determine the demographic structure of those who migrate (age, sex, education, etc.)
5) to find out the extend of people's involvement in agriculture.
6) to determine the perceptions of the respondents towards agriculture among the villagers.

1.5 Scope of Study
This study tries to examine the impact of migration in the study areas. The impact will be seen from various aspects, such as the impact on society as a whole, or impact on particular families, impact of migration on agriculture and development. The study areas involved three villages that practice various types of economic activities, including modern and traditional sector. All the three villages were previously involved actively in this sector and experiencing drastic declining in the participation lately.
2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the definition and component of migration, effect, theories and importance of the study of migration.

2.1 Definition of migration:

Migration is generally defined as a permanent change in place of residence by the crossing of specified administrative and political boundaries. The persons who fulfill these two criteria are regarded as migrants. Union Multilingual Demographic Dictionary (1958) defines migration as a form of spatial mobility between one geographical unit and another involving a permanent change of residence. But this definition excludes nomadic and or wandering people, seasonal migrants, and the movement back and forth persons with more than one residence.

According to Bouge (1959) theoretically, the terms migration is reserved for those changes of residence that involve a complete change and readjustment of the community affiliations of the individuals. While, Lee (1966) has considered migration as all moves, permanent or non-permanent change of residence, regardless the distance moves, whether forced or voluntary, furthermore he also concluded that migration as the residential changes of persons irrespective of its relative’s permanence or distance.

Mangalam (1968), defines migration as an emphasizing a change in the interaction system of migrants. In the other hand, Zelinsky (1971) stated migration as a process of simultaneous shifts of both spatial and social loci. Migration includes international flows of large numbers of refugees stimulated by wars, famine or political unrest; young adults moving between regions in
search of employment; middle aged professionals moving back to the land in their search for rural
retreat: families moving down the road to satisfy changing housing requirement; and gypsies and
other nomadic peoples whom mobility is a way of life.

According to Kammeyer and Ginn (1986), migration is as one of the three processes of
population change. They believed that migration has an impact on population growth and
composition. Furthermore, it can generate social integration as well as social conflict. Generally,
the definition given is:

“A migrant is a person who makes a permanent change in his or her regular place
of residence. While migration is the movement of individuals or groups from one
place of residence to another when they have the intention of remaining in a new
place for some substantial period of time” (1986:10)

Migration also been recognized in Iban as belajai. Kedit (1993) stated that in Iban culture, they
are used to make a journey, which he distinguish a few and included it all in bejalai. All the
journeys made are with specific mission. Some of the reason of a mission was to collect jungle
products to exchange for highly valued antique Chinese jars. Kedit concluded bejalai as an act “to
go on journeys with the view of acquiring wealth, material goods and social prestige” (1993:2).
Bejalai is not a single term that used to define the wandering Iban that go for a journey. There a
few terms that hold the same situation but used differently according to region. Another term that
is commonly used to define the nearly same activity as bejalai is belelang. Generally, this term
refers to activities that require the person to leave one country to another in search of job without
any certain day of return.

‘the men who is said to have belelang often does not keep in touch with his
families or kinsmen, and does not always return. Very often due to lack of
communications or remittances, his family does not know of his whereabouts.
Such men are assumed to have married and settle down in the country they
visited. Belelang is also used to describe persons who left their villages because
of some personal disaster or shame- such as family disputes and marital
problems-never return. If a man quarrels with his wife and threaten to belelang
(as opposed to bejalai) this means that he would desert his wife and family” (1993:3)

There are a few more terms that is closely related to bejalai, however it is not exactly the same meaning. Bekuli, kerja, pegi and kampar are those words that are closely related. Bekuli is to undertake labour, to take on labour migration, while kerja is to work as non-manual wage-earner, such as government servant. However, term pegi is used to as an equivalent term to bejalai but only used in other region (Sari bas). The last term that is closely related is kampar, which is mean to stay in a place or long-house as a visitor on an extended bejalai.

Defining migration: the component parts

According to Boyle et. al, migration involves the movement of the migrants from one place to another in certain period of time. In defining migration, certain issues such as, ‘how long’ and ‘how far’ certain migrants can move have to take into consideration.

“...migration must be distinguished from spatial mobility, which embraces all forms of geographical movement including flows of people over international borders at one extreme and trips to the local corner-shop at the other. Although it is impossible to define migration succinctly, in a way with which all researchers would agree, it is useful to identify some key components for any generally accepted definition.” (1998: 34)

Boyle et. al, pointed out a few components of migration. The first component concerns about movement over space. In this component, migration is defined as movement across the boundary of a unit area. The differentiation of individuals or society between the unit area is taken considerably. For a long-distance movement without crossing the boundary, it is not acclaimed as migration. The undertaking of crossing the boundary is one of the main concerns in recognizing migration in this component. However, when a short-distance movement is made and in the same time the boundary is crossed, this is known as migration. Besides the distance, the unit area also important in defining migration in this components. “...definition of the areal units to use is often
critical, as population redistribution between these units often has policy repercussion”. In his book, Boyle et al, take the situation in Britain as example, where the funding received from government is directly connected to local authority districts based on the size of residents between certain borders. These components also described internal migration, in-migrants, out-migrants, net migration, emigrants and international migration.

The second component part of migration stated is migration over time. Here migration are defined temporally, where it is about a permanence of movement. However, for those who are on vacation within a short period is not a migrant, while a persons that seek employment in another place for a certain particular time is recognized as migrants. There are also another type of migrants stated: seasonal migrants, where a person move to other place to work in certain season (for summer job for example) and go back to his/her original place after the season ended, business visitor and nomads. Boyle et al quote from Gould and Prothero (1975) in distinguishing between three type of movement: daily, periodic and seasonal. However, they stated “...these terms, which all relate to the permanence of the act of the moving, demonstrate the difficulty of separating people into the dichotomous categories of migrants and non-migrants” (1975:35).

Another type of migration stated is a return migrant. It is referring to those who leave his/her place for certain period of time and only will come back after a while. For example, a young men left his home to go to bigger city to seek for employment but return at a later date after earned enough money or failed to find suitable job. Another example is for retirees who return to his home town after a long period of time working outside his place. Elridge (1965) as stated by Boyle et al, “…distinguish between primary, secondary and return migrant based on the relationship between migration event and the region of birth” (1965:35). Primary migrants is refer to those who move out from the place of living for the first time, while secondary migrants is those who are not move into or out their place of birth and return migrants are those who return to their region of birth after move out for some period of time.
Return Migration in United States, 1955-1980

When investigating return migration in the United States, identifying return migrants is problematic but they can be defined as inter-state migrants returning to their state of birth. Given the size of the American states, many of these migrants may not have been returning to their specific birthplace but, even so, the results are illuminating. The census question on migration asked respondents to provide their residential location five years previously, allowing return migrants to be compared with those moving away from their birth state (primary migrants) and those moving between two states, neither of which was their birth state (secondary, or onward, migrants). Between the late 1950s and late 1970s primary migrants represented a declining percentage of inter-state migrants, while return and onward migrants increased. Those living outside their state of birth were only twice as likely to move on to another state as back to the one they were born in this indicates the importance of the return migration within America.


The third component of migration is ‘migration and spatial networks’. The first two component defined and measure migration from distance and permanence of movement while this component stress on spatial network framework that traces individuals through time and space. Instead of identify the places where those people live, they are asking about the places where they spent most of their time, either daily, monthly, or seasonal basis.

Culture is another component of migration. Bogue (1985) in Boyle et al (1998) describe migration as “...a moves that involve a complete change and readjustment of the community affiliations of the individuals” (page 37). The main concern in this component is arise when the issues of cultural change is particularly relevant when dealing with ethnic minority migration. Fieldling (1992a) as in Boyle et al (1998) argues that migration and cultural is both important event. He differentiates migration as ‘exciting and challenging’, which is as well as ‘rootless and sad’.

2.2 Types of Migration

Peterson (1958) in Kammeyer and Ginn (1988) developed the basic distinction between conservative and innovative migration. People that move from one place to another with the
objective to retain his or her existing way of life is called ‘conservative migration’. While innovative migration is the other way around; where people move from one place to another to change their life and obtain a new style of living. In addition, Peterson’s typology of migration has the following classes:

**Primitive Migration.** In this class of migration, people are moving because they are not able to cope with the natural or ecological forces. Therefore, the choose to migrate to keep on survive. this type of migration can falls either into conservative or innovative migration.

**Forced Migration.** This type of migration occur when group of people are forced by state or political power or military to move from their place. This type of migration is generate by the power that one individual or group possesses over another. These migrants do not have any power to decide whether to move or not, but usually they are willing to move since the condition is not under their control anymore.

**Impelled Migration.** This class of migration is more less the same as forced migration. However, people that involves with this type of migration able to decide whether they should move or not, even though there are some pressure to do so by authority.

**Free Migration.** This migration occur when individual on their own initiative actively search for new place to live. The people who best characterize free migration are pioneers, the trailblazer, and the adventurers. But free migration is a useful concept to describing the movement a group of people in open society.
Mass Migration. This migration occurs when people move because of social forces or social patterns. The movement is more a group pattern than individual choice. If this kind of migration occur, people has to make wise decision if they do not want to move, rather that decide to move.

Kammeyer and Ginn (1988) summarized each of this type of migration is associated with particular set of forces:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Migration</th>
<th>Preeminent Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primitive migration</td>
<td>Ecological or natural changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced migration</td>
<td>Political or physical force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impelled migration</td>
<td>Political or social pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free migration</td>
<td>Personal choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass migration</td>
<td>Social patterns and collective behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Theories of Migration

2.3.1 Lewis-Fei-Ranis Model

One of the oldest and influential theories of migration is Lewis Theory (1958). His theory later extended by Fei and Ranis (1961) where the same issue still become the main subject of discussion. In http://qed.econ.queensu.ca/pub/faculty/lloyd-ellis/econ835/migration.pdf, relationship between urban and rural migration are seen as supply and demand relationship. “It gives a central role in the development process to rural-urban migration: the “traditional” agricultural sector acts as a supplier of labour to the “modern” industrial sector. However, the modern sector can only grow if the agricultural sector produces more food than its producers require for their own consumption- there has to be an agricultural surplus”. They refer this relationship as ‘dual-economy’ but still take into consideration that both agriculture and industry may contain traditional and modern sectors. When the modern sectors start to generate capital
accumulation, they will create a demand for labour in market. This demand will pull the surplus labor in agriculture sector because there labors are non-intensive in term of producing agriculture output. Still they are existed in agriculture sector because they are subsistence and income sharing on family farms. They can create a ‘disguised unemployment’ in agriculture sector because they not productive. Since in agriculture sector remains the tradition of sharing income, non of the workers are received different level of income. The income is paid based on average yield, not on effort. So, if this people leave the sector, the impact of declining in yield can be reduced by increasing the labor hour on the remaining workers. The concept of ‘surplus labor’ and ‘disguised unemployment’ are brought up by Lewis-Fei-Ranis evolves in three phases.

The first phase they called it “surplus labor”. Started with the demands increase as the accumulation of capital are active, its later on create a migration into modern sector. The next phase are “disguised unemployment”. The levels of agriculture surplus begin to decline when the labor migrates. The price of food and agriculture output will rise and to cope with it, industrial sector supposed to increase the wage as well. The last phase is “commercialization”. In this phase the real competition between the modern and agriculture sectors started with the effect of disappearing of disguised unemployment in previous phase. The competition is on the real marginal product of labor in each sector are equated. The increase of demand for labor in industrial sector will lead to the falls of wage bill in agriculture sector.

However, these article stress out the few problems with this model:

1. It assumes that capital accumulates in an exogenous fashion, but does hot explain where this capital comes from and why it accumulates. Presumably capital accumulation must come from the savings of the population which may grow as production grows. However, this part of the development process is not part of the model. In this sense, the model does not really explain the
process of development, rather it illustrates one part of it. Moreover, capital accumulation
depends on the incentives faced by savers and entrepreneurs as well as the constraints that they
face. It is not clear how these factors interact with the process described by the model.

2. The LFR model also assumes that labour migrates in the simple way described. However, the
decision to migrate also depends on incentives that might be inconsistent with those described.
Some of these issues are discussed in the Harris-Todaro model below.

3. The assumption that the wage rate in agriculture is fixed until the phase of commercialization
is reached is strong. As labour is progressively withdrawn from agriculture there is more income
left for the remaining workers. Why don’t they share it and raise the wage. If they did then the
supply of labour to industry would not be perfectly elastic. The model must implicitly be
assuming that farms are being taxed at just the right rate as labour is withdrawn, or that
agricultural output is purely for subsistence.

2.2.2 Harris-Todaro Model

In Harris-Todaro model (http://qed.econ.queensu.ca/pub/faculty/lloyd-ellis/econ835/migration.pdf), the decision to involve with migration is originated from the
migrants themselves, without any other influences. But for those migrants that engage with
urban-rural migration, they have been drive to move to bigger cities because they assumes they
can earn more money in this new area. The main point in this model is that the market wage is
below a formal sector wage where the workers in the formal sector is more structured and
unionized with a certain intervention from government in supporting the effective wage such as:
minimum wage laws, unemployment benefit, pension schemes, and daycare. Labor union in city
set wages at a high level than market clearing level, so the wage in city will not fall drastically.
The wage that is gained from urban formal sector is higher than rural earning, and even higher