

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Title	Migration and Employment in Peninsular Malaysia, 1970.
Source	Economic Development & Cultural Change; Apr79, Vol. 27 Issue 3, p491, 14p
Author 1	Hawley, Amos H.
Author 2	Fernandez, Dorothy
Author 3	Singh, Harbans
Publication/Conference	NA
Edition	NA
Document Type	Article
CPI Primary Subject	Economics
CPI Secondary Subject	Employment; Migration ;
Geographic Terms	Malaysia;
Abstract	This article examines the migration and employment policies in Malaysia in 1970. Relationship between migrant status and employment status in a developing country; Two migration categories in Malaysia; Differences in the unemployment rates between migrants and non-migrants; Factors contributing to the low employment rates of migrants.

Centre for Policy Initiatives (CPI)

Pusat Iniatif Polisi

政策倡议中心

<http://www.cpiasia.org>

Migration and Employment in Peninsular Malaysia, 1970*

Amos H. Hawley
University of North Carolina

Dorothy Fernandez and Harbans Singh
Department of Statistics, Malaysian Government

In a survey of population policies in countries about the world, prepared by the United Nations Secretariat for the World Population Conference held in Bucharest in 1974,¹ it was found that 76 countries, comprising three-fifths of the world's population, had announced policies for the control of rural-urban migration. Somewhat over one-half of the less developed countries had adopted such policies. Most policies are aimed at diverting internal migration from large to small urban centers, while a few seek to prevent all urbanward movement from rural areas. Although no more than a few countries have progressed so far as to implement their policies, and those with discouraging results,² migration policies are shaping development plans in many Third World countries.

The support for migration-control policies is partly empirical and partly inferential. One fact beyond question is the very rapid growth rates of large cities in the less developed countries. Places of 100,000 or more population and capital cities grew in the 1960-70 decade at rates of more than 5% per year, or at about twice the growth rates of total populations in the respective countries.³ Much of that growth resulted from natural

* The authors are indebted to the Ford Foundation for support of the research reported in this paper.

¹ United Nations Secretariat, "Population Policies and Programs" (E/CONF. 60/BP/10), January 23, 1974.

² Aprodicio A. Lacquian and Alan B. Simmons, "Public Policy and Migratory Behavior in Selected Developing Countries," in *Urban Impact of Internal Migration*, ed. James White (Chapel Hill, N.C.: Institute for Research in Social Science, 1978).

³ Impressive as is this growth differential, it is not as extreme as that experienced by European countries in many decades of the nineteenth century when urban growth rates were 10 times or more higher than country growth rates, and that at a time when urban service and administrative technology was relatively

© 1979 by The University of Chicago. 0013-0079/79/2703-0028\$01.16

increase, but a very substantial fraction, variously estimated from 49%⁴ to 75%⁵ was supplied by net migration. How much might have been produced by reclassifications of adjacent territories is not known definitely, though it has been estimated to be about 15%.⁶

A second fact that impresses policymakers struggling with problems of development is the relatively high rates of unemployment that characterize urban labor forces. In the less developed countries for which data are available, unemployment rates in their cities were, in 1971, 50% to several hundred percent higher than the rates in rural areas.⁷ There are, of course, serious definitional difficulties in the reporting of employment status, difficulties which differ as between urban and rural sectors of the labor force. The problem centers on the incidence of unpaid family work and the sectoral peculiarities of underemployment, not to mention its elusiveness to observation. That all of the urban-rural differences in unemployment can be explained in terms of measurement errors seems unlikely, however.

A reasonable inference from high rates of urban growth in which migration comprises a large component coupled with relatively high urban unemployment rates would seem to be that rural-urban migration is excessive. Not only does migration exceed the available opportunities for employment, so goes the argument, it concentrates impoverished people in unhealthful conditions,⁸ it exposes unsophisticated migrants to exploitation, and it increases political discontent and the probability of conflict.⁹ More than that, large-scale migration to urban places aggravates economic imbalance in the development process. Scarce capital is diverted from development needs to provide the utilities and other urban service installations a dense population requires.¹⁰ Rural areas, on the other

undeveloped (Adna Weber, *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1899], chap. 2).

⁴ Kingsley Davis, "Cities and Mortality" (paper delivered at International Population Conference, Liege, 1973), p. 273.

⁵ World Bank, "Urbanization Sector Working Paper" (Washington, D.C., 1972), p. 80.

⁶ Davis.

⁷ Paul Bairoch, *Urban Unemployment in Developing Countries* (Geneva: International Labour Office, 1973), p. 49.

⁸ This allegation is contradicted by the very low mortality rates in large cities of less developed countries (see World Bank, *Population Policies and Programs* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1974], p. 18).

⁹ See William C. Thiesenhusen, "Latin America's Employment Problem," *Science* 171 (1971): 868-73; Bairoch, p. 5; World Bank, *Population Policies and Economic Development*, p. 18; F. C. Turner, "The Rush to Cities in Latin America," *Science* 192 (1976): 955-61; Elizier Brutzkus, "Centralized versus Decentralized Pattern of Urbanization in Developing Countries: An Attempt to Elucidate a Guideline Principle," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 23 (1975): 633-52.

¹⁰ *Urbanization in Asia and the Far East: Proceedings of the Joint UN/UNESCO Seminar, Bangkok* (Calcutta: UNESCO Research Center, 1957), p. 8; Guy Hunter, *The Best of Both Worlds* (New York: Oxford University Press,

hand, are deprived of the leadership potential of their educated youth as well as of the investment in their education. Comparing urban growth in the less developed countries today with that in the West during the nineteenth century, a World Bank report asserts that "the basic difference lies [today] in the relatively weak link between urbanization and economic development."¹¹

No attempt to answer this sweeping indictment will be made here. The present discussion is concerned with a more limited question: To what extent is urban unemployment in a less developed country a function of migration? Studies in Latin America and elsewhere throw revealing light on the question. Herrick's study of migration in Santiago, Chile, indicated that migrants had unemployment rates significantly below those of workers born and living in Santiago.¹² That was found to be true of both sexes and all ages. In a second paper Berry reports findings from two sources in Colombia: an analysis of the 1964 census data on employment status and the results of a 1967 survey of the eight largest cities of Colombia conducted by Centro de Estudios Sobre Desarrollo Economico.¹³ These investigations revealed age-specific unemployment rates of urban nonmigrants to be 20% higher on the average than the rates for migrants from rural areas. Preliminary data from Indonesia indicate that migrants to Jakarta, in 1972-74, had lower unemployment rates in the city than they had before migration and that employed migrants had somewhat higher incomes than did their rural counterparts.¹⁴

Berry's hypothesis to account for the migrant-native unemployment differential is that rural-urban migrants readily accept marginal employment (e.g., in service industries) while natives are willing to remain unemployed longer in order to obtain higher-level positions. The latter can tolerate protracted unemployment because they are able to live with their families during the waiting period. Only some migrants, on the other hand, can count on support from kinsmen while looking for work. Some credence is lent to Berry's argument by the short periods of waiting for employment by migrants—in Chile almost 70% of the migrants found

1967); William Alonso, "Urban and Regional Balances in Economic Development," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 17 (1968): 1-14.

¹¹ World Bank, *Population Policies and Economic Development*, p. 19.

¹² Bruce Herrick, *Urban Migration and Economic Development in Chile* (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1965), p. 84.

¹³ R. Albert Berry, "Open Unemployment as a Social Problem in Urban Colombia: Myth and Reality," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 23 (1975): 276-91.

¹⁴ John R. Harris, "Internal Migration in Indonesia: A Preliminary View," in White; see also Alden Speare, Jr., "The Determinants to Migration to a Major City in a Developing Country: Taichung, Taiwan," Population Paper, Institute of Economics, Academia Sinica (Taipei, Taiwan, 1972); Ashish Bose, "The Urbanization Process in South and Southeast Asia," in *Urbanization and National Development*, ed. Leo Jacobson and Ved Prakash, South and Southeast Asia Urban Affairs Annuals, vol. 1 (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1971), pp. 81-109.

employment within 2 months, and in Colombia 80% found employment within a like period. These short waiting periods might also have been affected by premigration labor recruitment, a practice that is common in other parts of the world.

A second hypothesis that might account for some portion of the low unemployment rates of rural migrants is that failures in the job market return to their villages. There is, thus, a selectivity at work which depresses migrant unemployment rates. But this, according to Simmons and Cardona,¹⁵ cannot be very important in the Colombian situation, for their studies of return migrants show them to have been better educated, to have originated from higher social-economic classes, and to have been more successful in finding urban employment than were nonreturnees. Apparently, many of the returning migrants did so to take positions in family enterprises. We have no way of knowing, however, the degree of generality of this type of return migration. Simmons and Cardona did not indicate whether the returnees in their study were students who necessarily had traveled from home for secondary and higher education and, upon completion of their education, had returned to their places of residence.

The 1970 census of population in Peninsular Malaysia provides another opportunity to examine the relationship between migrant status and employment status in a developing country. A 2% simple, random sample of the total enumerated population 10 years of age and over constitutes the data for this purpose. In the 1970 census, each person was asked how long he or she had lived in his or her present locality. The answers permit a distinction of persons who changed residence places before 1965 from those who moved after 1965. The difference is an important one in Malaysia, for much of the movement prior to 1965 was occasioned by the decade-long period of insurgency. In that period, refugee movements, forced migrations, and subsequent returns after the disorders were terminated comprised a large proportion of all moves. By contrast, the movements of the 1965–70 period more closely reflect the effects of redistributions of opportunity incidental to the development process. Thus, we have two migration categories: those who moved internally prior to 1965 and those who changed resident places within Peninsular Malaysia between 1965 and 1970. Another question asked in the census of 1970 identified persons who had lived in their localities since birth. Such persons are clearly nonmigrants, and they comprise the nonmigrant category.¹⁶

¹⁵ Alan B. Simmons and Ramiro Cardona G., "Rural-Urban Migration: Who Comes, Who Stays, Who Returns? The Case of Bogota, Colombia, 1929–1968," *International Migration Review* 6 (1972): 166–181.

¹⁶ The percentage distribution of the 1970 population by migrant status was nonmigrants, 56.5; internal migrants, 35.8 (moved prior to 1965, 19.7; moved 1965–70, 16.1); external migrants, 7.7. Since in this discussion we are interested only in internal migration, the last category, external migrants, is excluded from consideration.

In Peninsular Malaysia migrants had, in 1970, unemployment rates¹⁷ substantially below those for nonmigrants. As may be seen in table 1, the average unemployment rate for migrants was 25% or more below the average rate among nonmigrants. But the differences among the rates were doubtlessly affected to some extent by differences in age compositions. The very low rates for early migrants, those who moved prior to 1965, were due to their higher average age and, presumably, their greater labor force experience. Standardization of the comparison on the age composition of nonmigrants raises the early migrant rate from 5.0% to 7.3%. Their unemployment risk is revealed to have been much more like that to which nonmigrants were subject. On the other hand, the standardized average rate for recent migrants is below their actual rate, because of their relatively young age composition, though the effect works in opposite directions as between the two sexes. The sample size prevents our pursuing the age and sex effect on unemployment through other analysis to follow, so it should be remembered that unstandardized comparisons understate rates for early migrants and overstate the rates for later migrants.

The difference in unemployment rates as between nonmigrants and migrants occurred in all sizes and types of places, as table 2 shows. It was particularly wide for recent migrants, but the difference narrowed for both classes in each smaller size-class of places. Unfortunately, the census data do not permit an identification of return migrants to town and county origins; consequently, there is no way of knowing to what extent the low

TABLE 1
AGE-SEX SPECIFIC UNEMPLOYMENT RATES AND UNADJUSTED AND AGE-ADJUSTED*
TOTAL RATES, BY MIGRANT STATUS, PENINSULA MALAYSIA, 1970

AGE (Years)	NONMIGRANTS			MIGRANTS PRIOR TO 1965			MIGRANTS, 1965-70		
	Total	Male	Fe- male	Total	Male	Fe- male	Total	Male	Fe- male
10-14.....	22.2	20.3	25.0	25.2	27.5	21.2	19.2	17.4	29.9
15-24.....	17.0	14.8	20.5	13.3	12.0	15.3	10.7	8.4	15.0
25-34.....	3.9	3.5	4.8	3.0	3.0	3.8	3.2	2.6	4.8
35-44.....	2.6	2.0	3.6	1.7	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.0	3.0
45-54.....	2.5	1.8	3.9	2.4	1.9	3.4	2.4	2.0	3.7
55-64.....	2.2	1.7	3.3	2.3	2.2	2.8	3.1	3.1	3.5
65+.....	2.9	2.8	3.2	2.9	1.8	7.1	1.7	1.9	...
Unadjusted total.....	8.9	7.5	11.6	5.0	4.4	6.3	6.5	3.6	10.6
Adjusted total.	...	...	...	7.3	6.5	8.9	6.2	5.0	9.4
Median labor force age...	28.0	28.8	26.0	34.6	36.2	32.6	26.8	29.4	23.7

* Adjusted to nonmigrant age distribution.

¹⁷ Unemployment is here defined as including persons without a regular job and looking for work and persons working in family enterprises at less than 3 hours per day who reported no regular occupation.

TABLE 2
LABOR FORCE UNEMPLOYED BY MIGRANT STATUS AND SIZE AND TYPE OF
PLACE OF RESIDENCE, PENINSULAR MALAYSIA, 1970
(%)

MIGRANT STATUS	ALL PLACES	CITIES			RURAL AREA
		75,000 and over	10,000– 25,000	1,000– 10,000	
Total labor force.....	7.0	9.0	8.9	6.5	6.2
Nonmigrants (lived in locality since birth).....	8.9	11.5	10.8	7.5	7.2
Migrants:					
Moved before 1965.....	5.0	5.3	6.3	4.7	4.3
Moved 1965–70.....	6.5	7.1	6.1	6.8	5.8
All migrants.....	5.3	6.4	6.2	5.4	4.9

rates for migrants were due to a tendency on the part of disappointed job seekers to return to their places of previous residence. But, since urbanward movement has advanced up the size scale,¹⁸ return movements might be expected to have drifted downward on the size scale. If so, returnees to small towns and rural areas must have found employment in such places, for those places reported the lowest frequencies of unemployment. The alternative, of course, is that return migration was a relatively unimportant solution to urban unemployment. Having moved, the migrants might have stayed in their destinations.

The Malaysian data permit a partial examination of Berry's hypothesis that low unemployment rates among migrants are due to their greater readiness to accept marginal employments. Without income data, marginality cannot be given a very satisfactory definition. The service industry, however, is commonly regarded as a principal catchall for relatively unorganized, transitory, and poorly paid employments, especially in less developed economies. Assuming that to be the case in the Malaysian economy, it is indeed true that migrants to large cities concentrated in marginal employments, as table 3 shows. Furthermore, migrant employment in service industry declined with the size of place. But that is also true of nonmigrant employment. Service is, of course, an urban and a growth industry. Hence, a concentration of migrants in that industry in large cities is not *prima facie* evidence of excess migration. It may indicate that migrants tended to find employment in growing industry more readily than did nonmigrants. There is also some suggestion in table 3 that newcomers found service industry an easy point of entry into the urban economy and that they subsequently transferred to other types of industry. Unlike service industry, commerce, also a catchall industry, had higher employment proportions among nonmigrants than among migrants in all categories of places except for rural areas.

¹⁸ Charles Hirschman, "Recent Urbanization Trends in Peninsular Malaysia," *Demography* 13 (1976): 445–62.

The industry categories shown in table 3 are, of course, exceedingly broad. Each embraces a great deal of diversity. That is no less true of the service industry than of others. A clearer picture of types of migrant employment is obtained from an examination of their occupational distributions, as shown in table 4. While it remains true that migrants were over-represented in service occupations (composed largely of domestic and protective service workers), their concentration was considerably less than when viewed in industrial terms alone. Migrants were, however, more than twice as numerous as nonmigrants in service occupations, relatively speaking, in all size-of-place categories, rather than just in small towns and rural areas as shown in the industrial distribution. But in the biggest cities migrants were underrepresented in sales work, which in-

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTS OF TYPES OF PLACE, BY INDUSTRY
AND MIGRANT STATUS, PENINSULAR MALAYSIA, 1970
(%)

INDUSTRY	ALL PLACES	CITIES			RURAL AREA
		75,000 and over	10,000- 75,000	1,000- 10,000	
Nonmigrants					
Agriculture and mining.....	60.7	5.9	22.8	55.8	80.5
Manufacturing and construc- tion.....	12.3	29.6	25.4	12.8	6.0
Commerce.....	9.7	22.1	17.1	13.8	4.8
Transportation, communica- tion, and utilities.....	4.1	10.6	7.2	4.2	2.1
Service.....	13.3	31.8	27.5	13.4	6.6
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Migrants prior to 1965					
Agriculture and mining.....	58.8	6.2	16.7	48.0	80.6
Manufacturing and construc- tion.....	9.7	21.2	19.0	10.9	5.2
Commerce.....	9.3	20.7	17.4	13.0	4.5
Transportation, communica- tion, and utilities.....	4.5	11.7	8.6	4.8	2.1
Service.....	17.6	40.1	38.3	23.2	7.6
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Migrants 1965-70					
Agriculture and mining.....	44.4	2.6	9.2	26.1	66.0
Manufacturing and construc- tion.....	13.7	24.4	22.0	12.2	9.4
Commerce.....	8.8	13.1	15.8	10.2	6.0
Transportation, communica- tion, and utilities.....	4.6	8.7	7.7	6.2	2.6
Service.....	28.5	51.2	45.3	45.3	16.0
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

cludes hawking and peddling, and only somewhat more numerous in the category of laborers. They also appeared somewhat more frequently than expected in professional and technical operations. This and other occupational differences widens in successively smaller size-classes of places. Comparisons of occupational distributions as between migrants and non-migrants measured in coefficients of dissimilarity show early migrants differing moderately and late migrants quite significantly from nonmigrants. Whether that represents a historic shift in migrant selectivity or a pattern of migrant accommodation to circumstances at destinations cannot be determined from the data in hand.

The advisability of examining occupational distributions within in-

TABLE 4
DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED WORKERS BY OCCUPATION, TYPE OF PLACE OF RESIDENCE, AND MIGRANT STATUS, PENINSULAR MALAYSIA, 1970 (%)

OCCUPATION	ALL PLACES	CITIES			RURAL AREA
		75,000 and over	10,000- 75,000	1,000- 10,000	
Nonmigrants					
Professional and technical....	4.0	10.1	7.7	3.4	1.9
Administrative.....	.4	1.3	.7	.4	.2
Clerical.....	4.5	15.8	8.1	2.9	1.5
Sales.....	8.4	17.1	15.1	13.2	4.4
Service.....	5.0	12.8	10.9	4.6	2.2
Farming.....	57.8	2.9	20.4	51.3	78.2
Production.....	16.3	35.0	31.4	19.3	8.9
Laborers.....	3.6	5.0	5.7	4.9	2.7
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Migrants prior to 1965					
Professional and technical....	5.2	11.1	12.7	7.1	2.1
Administrative.....	.7	2.0	1.7	.5	.3
Clerical.....	5.2	16.7	9.1	4.6	2.0
Sales.....	7.9	14.5	15.1	11.7	4.2
Service.....	7.7	16.5	16.3	9.5	3.8
Farming.....	53.0	3.6	13.0	43.9	73.4
Production.....	16.6	30.2	27.1	18.2	11.3
Laborers.....	3.7	5.4	5.0	4.5	2.9
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Migrants 1965-70					
Professional and technical....	10.5	20.8	14.5	17.4	5.1
Administrative.....	.8	1.5	1.6	1.0	.4
Clerical.....	6.8	13.2	10.2	7.7	3.8
Sales.....	6.2	7.7	12.0	8.9	4.3
Service.....	15.1	28.0	21.6	20.0	8.8
Farming.....	37.1	1.7	6.1	23.0	56.8
Production.....	19.4	21.7	29.1	16.4	17.5
Laborers.....	4.1	5.4	4.9	5.6	3.3
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

dustry categories before drawing any conclusions about the employment characteristics of migrants is made apparent in table 5. Half or more of the migrants engaged in service industry reported other than service occupations. Or, measured in another way, almost two-fifths, 37.1% of the late migrants and 40.4% of the early migrants, were in white-collar occupations, exclusive of sales. A comparable figure for nonmigrants was 41.8%. All of these figures would be higher were it not for the practice in Malaysia of grouping many administrative workers in other occupa-

TABLE 5
DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED LABOR FORCE BY OCCUPATION, INDUSTRY,
AND MIGRANT STATUS, PENINSULAR MALAYSIA, 1970
(%)

Occupation	All Industries	Agriculture and Mining	Manufacturing and Construction	Commerce	Transportation, Communications, Utilities	Service
Nonmigrants						
Professional and technical.....	3.9	.1	1.2	.5	1.5	27.1
Administrative...	.4	.1	1.7	.6	.8	.8
Clerical.....	4.2	.4	3.1	9.5	18.6	14.5
Sales.....	8.3	...	2.1	81.5	.5	1.1
Service.....	5.0	.2	.8	.8	2.3	34.4
Farming.....	58.6	94.9	.4	.2	1.0	4.8
Production.....	16.2	3.4	84.7	6.0	66.5	4.6
Laborers.....	3.4	.9	6.0	.9	8.8	12.7
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Migrants prior to 1965						
Professional and technical.....	5.2	.2	.9	1.0	5.0	26.6
Administrative...	.7	.1	3.4	.7	1.5	.9
Clerical.....	5.0	.8	4.5	10.2	19.0	12.9
Sales.....	7.7	...	1.7	79.7	.4	.6
Service.....	7.8	.8	1.4	1.0	2.7	39.8
Farming.....	53.4	89.2	.3	.5	.4	4.7
Production.....	16.6	7.7	80.4	6.2	62.5	4.9
Laborers.....	3.6	1.2	7.4	.7	8.5	9.6
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Migrants 1965-70						
Professional and technical.....	8.6	.8	2.7	1.8	7.6	26.0
Administrative...	.9	.3	2.7	1.0	1.2	.7
Clerical.....	6.6	1.4	5.5	13.3	23.8	10.4
Sales.....	6.4	.1	2.0	67.6	...	.5
Service.....	15.6	1.0	1.3	1.2	4.3	51.5
Farming.....	38.2	83.3	.6	4.8	.5	1.9
Production.....	19.7	11.8	76.5	9.1	50.2	3.3
Laborers.....	4.0	1.2	8.7	1.2	12.4	5.7
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

tional classes. Commerce, the other industrial class containing many casual workers, showed 81.1% in sales and 11.0% in other white-collar occupations among nonmigrants, but among migrants only 67.6% and 79.7% of late and early migrants, respectively, were employed in sales occupations. Laborers, a third open occupation, were but slightly more frequent among migrants. Migrants in that occupation were underrepresented in service industry and overrepresented in transportation, communication, and utility industries. These data provide no basis for concluding that there has been a pronounced tendency for migrants to escape unemployment by concentrating in marginal occupations.

Nor can it be argued that nonmigrants in Malaysia were better qualified in respect to educational attainment for participation in the labor force than were migrants. Table 6 shows that while the proportions of employed workers who had advanced beyond the level of primary educa-

TABLE 6
DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED WORKERS BY OCCUPATION, EDUCATION,
AND MIGRANT STATUS, PENINSULAR MALAYSIA, 1970
(%)

Occupation	All Levels	No Education	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary
Nonmigrants					
Professional and technical . . .	100.0	2.6	21.3	68.6	7.5
Administrative	100.0	5.3	48.2	43.9	2.6
Clerical	100.0	1.4	20.4	75.3	3.0
Sales	100.0	16.9	57.0	25.4	.6
Service	100.0	18.7	63.7	17.5	.2
Farming	100.0	40.7	54.5	4.6	.2
Production	100.0	17.1	65.0	17.6	.4
Laborer	100.0	18.7	69.6	11.2	.5
All workers	100.0	29.5	54.6	15.2	.7
Migrants prior to 1965					
Professional and technical . . .	100.0	2.3	16.8	69.6	11.3
Administrative	100.0	2.4	54.2	36.1	7.2
Clerical	100.0	1.3	22.4	72.6	3.6
Sales	100.0	19.7	61.9	17.7	.8
Service	100.0	21.1	64.6	13.7	.7
Farming	100.0	43.9	52.5	3.3	.3
Production	100.0	17.7	68.4	13.4	.5
Laborer	100.0	22.3	65.7	12.1	.0
All workers	100.0	30.4	53.9	14.5	1.2
Migrants 1965-70					
Professional and technical . . .	100.0	.8	12.6	71.1	15.5
Administrative	100.0	6.3	17.4	36.6	22.7
Clerical	100.0	.8	11.6	81.0	6.6
Sales	100.0	11.2	61.1	26.0	1.7
Service	100.0	9.8	56.0	33.6	.6
Farming	100.0	33.4	60.1	5.9	.5
Production	100.0	10.8	67.3	21.5	.4
Laborer	100.0	12.6	71.1	16.0	.3
All workers	100.0	15.5	55.3	26.7	2.5

tion were similar for both nonmigrants and early migrants they were substantially greater among recent migrants. Moreover, the educational superiority of recent migrants obtained in the occupational categories containing the more tenuous employments—namely, sales, service, and laborers—as well as in all other categories. Thus, it appears that recent migrants might have been more prone to accept jobs with educational requirements below their attainments than were workers in other migrant-status classes. That tendency, if true, was confined to persons with some secondary education; it did not occur among those who had advanced- to tertiary-levels of education. But since both the occupational and the educational categories used in table 6 are very broad, no dependable conclusion pertaining to frequencies of education-occupation mismatches can be stated.

The Malaysian data also enable us to examine the hypothesis that migrants, lacking the shelter of familial households, were unable to wait for preferred employment, as could nonmigrants. Consequently, they were inclined to accept employment in the more open and marginal occupations. This argument does not find support in the Malaysian experience. As may be seen in table 7, 95% or more of all migrants in the labor force lived in households—95% of employed migrants, 98%–99% of unemployed migrants.¹⁹ Migrants who were not members of nuclear family units, such as other relatives and boarders, might be expected to have been most exposed to nonsupport by kinsmen or friends. But that was not the case; almost all such persons lived in households.²⁰ And that was particularly true of the inexperienced unemployed. Missing from these data, of course, are the effects of return migration. The “head” category of unemployed, for example, might have been depleted by return migration and the relative number of one or another of the household member categories augmented by that countermovement.

Since the assumption underlying the type of residence hypothesis is not applicable to Malaysia, what about the inference? In table 8, in which the answer to that question may be found, occupations are grouped to constitute the white-collar class, open or marginal occupations, and other blue-collar occupations. It is evident that the children of nonmigrants were more disposed to accept employment in the open occupations than were the children of recent migrants. The latter were found more frequently in white-collar occupations. The occupational distribution of other relatives was considerably different, however; those who were migrants were engaged in open occupations much more frequently than were nonmigrant other relatives. But the difference there was no more pronounced than it was among nonmigrant and migrant household heads.

¹⁹ These percentages include institutional households. But they account for a mere 2.2% of the total population.

²⁰ Seventy-three percent of all boarders lived in private households.

TABLE 7
DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANT STATUS POPULATION BY HOUSEHOLD MEMBERSHIP AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS, PENINSULAR MALAYSIA, 1970
(%)

EMPLOYMENT AND MIGRANT STATUS	TOTAL	LIVE ALONE	LIVE IN HOUSEHOLDS						
			Head	Spouse	Unmarried Children	Relatives	Boarders	Servants	Visitors
Employed.....	100.0	2.1	47.8	15.8	21.1	5.2	4.0	2.8	1.2
Nonmigrants.....	100.0	2.0	45.5	15.4	28.6	5.3	1.4	1.2	.6
Migrants prior to 1965.....	100.0	3.2	54.6	19.8	13.1	3.9	2.4	2.2	.8
Migrants 1965-70.....	100.0	5.3	42.1	11.8	8.9	6.8	13.7	8.0	3.4
All unemployed.....	100.0	1.0	13.0	8.2	61.9	11.0	2.8	.9	1.2
Nonmigrants.....	100.0	.9	11.2	6.5	69.2	9.1	1.8	.4	.9
Migrants prior to 1965.....	100.0	.6	20.1	11.5	55.9	9.0	1.1	.8	1.0
Migrants 1965-70.....	100.0	1.8	13.2	12.7	35.4	21.7	9.1	3.1	3.0
Inexperienced unemployed.....	100.0	.7	7.1	3.0	71.7	11.8	3.5	.2	2.0
Nonmigrants.....	100.0	.6	6.0	2.1	78.7	9.4	2.3	.1	.8
Migrants prior to 1965.....	100.0	.8	11.2	4.6	70.2	9.9	1.3	.2	1.8
Migrants 1965-70.....	100.0	1.2	7.9	5.4	43.3	23.5	10.6	.5	7.6

TABLE 8
DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES BY HOUSEHOLD MEMBERSHIP AND MIGRANT STATUS, PENINSULAR MALAYSIA, 1970
(%)

MIGRANT STATUS AND OCCUPATION	LIVE IN HOUSEHOLDS						
	TOTAL	LIVE ALONE	Head	Spouse	Unmarried Children	Relatives	Others . Visitors
Nonmigrants	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional, administrative, clerical	8.9	8.1	8.4	5.3	11.1	9.3	10.5
Sales, service, laborer	17.2	24.6	16.9	8.9	17.8	18.9	18.0
Farming and production	71.9	62.3	74.7	85.8	71.1	71.8	71.5
Migrants prior to 1965	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional, administrative, clerical	11.0	14.6	11.4	6.9	12.6	12.2	8.0
Sales, service, laborer	19.4	24.3	20.4	10.4	18.3	23.0	25.1
Farming and production	69.6	61.1	68.2	82.7	69.1	64.8	66.9
Migrants 1965-70	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional, administrative, clerical	16.9	24.5	18.2	16.2	15.9	16.2	10.3
Sales, service, laborer	25.9	27.8	24.5	9.0	15.2	27.1	11.6
Farming and production	57.2	47.7	57.3	74.8	68.9	56.7	78.1

The point is that differential occupational selection tendencies operated as among household members of migrant-status classes, not as between persons who were or were not household members. Thus, it appears that at best the hypothesis finds a very qualified support in the Malaysian data.

Nothing in the data presented here supports a contention that unemployment in Malaysian cities or rural areas was a direct result of migration.²¹ By the same token, there is no support for a hypothesis of overurbanization.²² On the contrary, it might be argued that migrants made a useful contribution to development. They filled labor force roles that nonmigrants were unwilling or unable to occupy. Insofar as education is a necessary qualification for urban employment, migrants were clearly better prepared for entry into the active labor force than were nonmigrants.

On the other hand, it is quite possible that migrants might have had an indirect effect on urban unemployment, especially in the larger cities. The ratio of migrants, both early and recent migrants, to nonmigrants was greatest where nonmigrant unemployment was highest. It is possible that migrants accepted less pay for given employments and thus preempted jobs in all occupational categories. If so, it was not because they were without the support of relatives and friends for, as we have seen, all but a very few lived in households.

Clearly, a number of pertinent questions remain unanswered. Differences as between migrant-status groups in the period of waiting for employment after entering the labor force are not known. The extent to which migrants are recruited for employment needs to be known. Nor is there information on differences in beginning wage rates for comparable occupations and similar levels of educational attainment. Furthermore, the incidence and character of urban underemployment have not been adequately explored and measured. And, finally, the frequency and the circumstances of return migration may bear importantly on differential unemployment rates. Matters such as these can seldom be investigated with census data. They must await the conduct of fairly intensive field studies.

Although the state of knowledge on the effects of urbanward migration in less developed countries is imperfect, the knowledge that is available suggests that migration control policies are uninformed, if not misinformed. On this score, the Malaysian experience appears to be in accord with experience elsewhere.

²¹ S. M. Pandry finds evidence in India that refutes a rural pressure explanation of rural-urban migration ("Nature and Determinants of Urbanization in a Developing Economy: The Case of India," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 24 [1977]: 265-78).

²² This is not to say, however, that urbanization in Malaysia is not in excess of what the economy requires for optimum operation.