

WHY PEOPLE MOVE: A PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF URBAN MIGRATION

Faturochman¹

Abstrak

Adanya arus masuk penduduk dari desa ke kota ternyata tidak hanya sebagai dampak dari daya tarik kota saja, akan tetapi ada faktor-faktor internal atau karakteristik-karakteristik individu lainnya yang mempengaruhinya. Beberapa faktor tersebut mendasari keputusan seseorang untuk melakukan migrasi. Tulisan ini mengupas tentang migrasi dari sudut pandang psikologi. Sisi pertama adalah membahas tentang karakteristik-karakteristik individu yang secara potensial mempengaruhi penduduk untuk melakukan migrasi. Sisi kedua adalah proses psikologis yang disebabkan oleh kondisi sosial ekonomi sehingga menekan seseorang berkeputusan untuk melakukan migrasi.

Introduction

Urban population growth still exists and may continue for the next several years. Three factors affecting that growth are natural increase, migration, and reclassification. In the 1970s, the contribution of natural increase was about 55 percent (United Nations, 1980) and in the 1980s it was about 60 percent (World Bank, 1984). If reclassification has been predicted as contributing about 10 percent to the growth, the percentage of contribution of migration, which is about 30 percent, is quite important. The importance of migration has become since most migrants have high fertility rates. It means that the great contribution of natural increase to urban growth is the indirect impact of migration.

¹ Drs. Faturochman adalah staf pengajar Fakultas Psikologi UGM dan Peneliti Pusat Penelitian Kependudukan UGM.

The explanation of urban migration, briefly, can be divided into two categories, micro-level and macro-level. These approaches have different methods and consequences in the operational context. Surveys have been more common in the micro-level approach than in macro-level in which usually uses census methods and data. Rural inequality, the spread of capitalism, uneven development, urban bias and government policies are kinds of macro-level or structural explanations. On the other hand, micro-level or individual or behavioral explanations include economics, education and employment, bright light, culture, etc.

There is no one approach that can explain urban migration completely. Even though the explanation of economic motive of the individual seems to be dominant, it does not mean that other motives are not necessary. It gives the opportunity for other approaches to explaining urban migration phenomena.

This paper tries to explain urban migration by using psychological analysis that has been used only recently (Fawcett, 1986).

The Motivation to Migrate

The psychological explanation of urban migration in this paper will emphasize two aspects. The first is the characteristics that potentially affect people to migrate; the second is the psychological process of migration which stresses the decision-making process.

People move not only because of external factors such as the attraction of cities (Yap, 1977), but is also caused by internal factors or individual characteristics. Psychological factors, at least, mediate on moving people (Stokol and Shumaker, 1982). This statement is referring to an essential assumption that was explained by Lewin's formulation (1935). He states that behaviour is the function of personal and environmental or external factors. Mathematically, the formulation is $B = f(P, E)$,

whereas

B: behaviour

P: personal or internal factors

E: environmental or external factors

The formulation implies that there are interactions between internal and external factors. Sometimes external factors can dominate, inversely, internal factors perhaps will be more important. Unfortunately, the formulation cannot explain when a factor is more important rather than the other one.

Personality variables which influence urban migration have been found by Winchie and Carment (1988). Their findings shows that migrants and nonmigrants are different world news, risk-taking, and achievement motiovation are examples of personality variables which differentiate migrants and nonmigrants. Affandi (1965) found that independence is an important characteristic of migrants. Independent people seem more likely to move rather than less independent people.

Besides personal characteristics of internal factors, motivation predictively has significant effects on urban migration as a behaviour. Motivation cannot be separated from the experience of people who will move or have moved. Economic motives are general terms. In more specific terms econmic variables can be occupational satisfaction (Winchie and Carment, 1988) or health (Hsieh and Liu, 1983).

Fawcett and de Jong (1981) propose a psychological model of migration, called Value-Expectancy Model. This model is based on Subjective Expected Utility Model (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975) which argues that if someone decides to act, he or she will choose an alternative that will give the greatest subjective benefit to him or her. According to the model, migration is assumed as an instrument of behaviour to achieve a goal and the decision is based on cognitive considerations. Of course, the model is subjectively oriented.

There are seven concepts that basically influence people to move according to Fawcett's model. The first is wealth motivation. Factors included in this concept are having a high and stable income, economic security in old age, being able to afford basic needs or some luxuries, having access to welfare payments and other economic benefits.

Second, social status includes having a prestigious job, being looked up to in the community, obtaining good education, and having power and influence, can motivate people to move and to get them. Expected values from wealth and social status are very close, so that it is sometimes difficult to separate them; high economic status obviously will be followed by social status.

Comfort resulting from better social and work life is the next motivation. Comfortable housing, life in a pleasant community, and having ample leisure time are some examples of well being. Some research in the United states (Hsieh and Liu, 1983; Liu, 1975) find that this motivation has been the most important factor affecting people to move. In analysing this aspect subjective views seem to be very dominant. Objectively, rural areas, in many cases, have better condition but people's perceptions can be different from objective conditions.

Fourth, excitement stimulant is needed to balance life as well as doing new things, being able to meet a variety of people, and keeping active and busy.

Fifth, autonomy, which refers to personal freedom for many people is very important. Free from traditional customs or political freedom are reasonable to be motives to move as well having privacy and being free to say and do what they want.

The sixth is the need for affiliation, such as in Javanese community who give high value in this concepts, can reduce motives to migrate. One reasonable reason of the low rate of old migrants is also social affiliation in which their social attachment with social atmosphere in areas of origin is high. *Bedhol desa* transmigration (migration of most people of a village) is an example to anticipate the high affiliation motivation in migration.

Finally, morality which refers to value systems such as Javanese, or Minangkabau value in contrast, affects migration behaviour in several cases. Sometimes people move to live in a community with a favourable moral climate that seems in contrast with economic cost-benefit model.

Value-expectancy model considers other variables such as demographic factors that influence people to decide their migration

goals. Education, for example, has a significant effect on urban migration, people who move have a relatively higher education level than nonmigrants. From a psychological perspective, higher education creates a higher level aspiration. If the aspiration cannot be manifested in the area of origin, people will move to the other place they think will give the opportunity for expressing their aspiration. The expectancy to reach the goal is also affected by the differences of opportunities between origin and destination areas; it seems to consider the cost-benefit model (Ritchey, 1976).

Affandi (1985) uses the model and finds that for people who will migrate, wealth motivation is the most important, followed by independence and well being. On the other hand, people who do not want to move have high affiliation motives. The result, once again, shows that personal background, specifically personal characteristics, have to be considered in analysis of migration.

Explaining the motivation of migration also can use Maslow's (1970) Hierarchy of Needs. The five hierarchy of needs are physiological needs such as food and drink, safety needs, belonging and love needs, esteem needs, and need for general. For the poor people economic motives mean food and drink or basic needs, it can mean self-actualization such as moving from more traditional to more modern life style or society. This reason can be applied to understand the differences of motivation of migration between more developed and less developed countries.

Migration Decision-Making

Motives to migrate seem to be different among countries. In less developed countries, origin-destination wage gaps motivate people to move (Hugo, 1987; Mazumdar, 1987; Rhoda, 1983). Most migrants in less developed countries are labourers and they move to get a better income. Cebula and Vedder (1973) concluded that decision to migrate is treated as an investment decision. Economically, migrants calculate the cost-benefit of migration. In the countries where economic growth is better, the cost-benefit calculation is not only based on economic considerations but also social and psychological cost and benefit. Unfortunately, with the exception of economic cost-benefit, the calculation will be difficult.

The cost-benefit model of the decision-making process is based on the push and pull framework (Ritchey, 1976). The other approaches to the decision-making process within the push and pull framework are adjustment-to-stress and modes-of-orientation approaches. The adjustment-to-stress approach seems to be applicable in explaining intra-urban mobility since the environmental stress frequently happens in urban rather than in rural areas or small towns. The assumption of this model is that mobility was as a form of adaptation to stress in the environment. In addition, the basis of any decision to migrate is the belief that the level of satisfaction obtainable elsewhere is greater than its present of satisfaction (Wolpert cited in Lewis, 1982).

Critiques faced by the adjustment-to-stress model emphasize on the difficulties of measuring residential stress or dissatisfaction. At the micro-level approach this model will be better and more explainable than at macro-level.

Cost-benefit and adjustment-to-stress models are useful for specific analysis. Because there are many types of migrations, those models will be limited in applications. The modes-of-orientation approach works in more various migrations. There are three types of modes-of-orientation including the purposive rational mode which is characterized by short and long run consequences of alternatives to plan of action to attain future goals, the traditional mode in which decision is determined by custom or habit, and the short-run hedonistic mode which is made on the basis of immediate needs and feelings (Ritchey, 1976).

Examples of mode-of-orientation approaches have been mentioned before. Minangkabau men from West Sumatra traditionally move to other regions, called *merantau*, or the Buginess from South Sulawesi, sometimes difficult to be explained because they have done it for many centuries. The short-run hedonistic mode, on the other hand, can be applied in very specific cases. The purposive rational mode may be more common and complicated in analysing migration cases. Many scholars conclude that the most important motive to migrate is economic (Lewis, 1982; Mazumdar, 1987; and Yap, 1977) but in the long run it can change to life style or quality of life (Hsieh and Liu, 1983).

A common aspect of decision making processes is the stage of search behavior, information processing, and evaluation of different alternatives which are done individually before moving. In other words, before choosing to move or not, someone will try to search as far as possible the information such as jobs and housing, and then try to identify the consequences of the decision from many alternatives.

The process is too general and it fails to go into more detail. Heberkorn (1981) proposes the social psychological considerations of the migration decision-making process approach to clarify the more complex and systematic decision-making process. His approach is based on the assumption that migration is voluntary and as conscious and goal-directed as other behavior, and uses Janis and Man's (1977) conflict model of decision-making.

In the first stage of the model, called appraising the challenge, variables included are individual characteristics such as willingness to take risk and pioneer personality, psychological and social community integration, achievement motivation, and locus of control. Such variables have been described above.

The second stage is surveying alternatives, which includes migration expectation, perception of available alternatives, and cultural and social norms. In this stage people not only calculate the cost and benefit of migration but also consider norms which have been internalized in their life. Their expectations may be initiated by information they got before or the information may strengthen the expectation. Many alternatives considered finally will depend on individual perception that may be affected by norms.

Weighing of alternatives is the third stage. Alternatives are theoretically screened with regard to advantage and disadvantage. In this stage conflict may exist because weighing is not simple a process. It is difficult to find that an alternative is extremely advantageous or disadvantageous. On the other hand, internal factors such as individual decision-making experience (Fuller, Lightfoot, Kamnuasilpa, 1985), cognitive and functional fixedness, individual and social conflict will influence the process.

The process will continue to the next stage, deliberating about commitment. Social and cultural norms, again, have important functions in this stage. Individualistic orientation will help to pass this stage easily rather than social orientation which needs social approval.

Finally, an individual may meet with different or contradictory information which is inconsistent with the decision he or she has made. In this case he or she will use rejected alternatives and reconsider all decisions that have been made. If he or she moved and found different reality he or she may use individual coping strategies. The other alternative is to go back to the area of origin. It is one explanation why counter-migration takes place.

Final Note

There are many types of urban migration. According to duration of living, it can be divided into commuting, circular and permanent migration. The average skill of urban migrants is less skilled than urban nonmigrants, however, some skilled and more educated also move as urban migrants. To analyse urban migration one has to consider the type of migrants. Motivation and decision making to migrate will be different in each type. Dependents such as children who are involved in migration cannot give contribution on the decision-making process.

This paper tries to explain urban migration motives and decision-making as a general concept. To imply the analysis in a policy is difficult. But, some considerations can be derived from the analysis. First, migration should not be regarded as an end in itself but as a means to an end (Clark and Moore, 1982). So, the policy implication of urban migration should be based on the goal itself which varies for each person.

Second, the problem may not be why people migrate, but why people choose to migrate (Rossi and Shlay, 1982). Stress on migration decision-making is very important in order to make a policy. Perception and attribution to urban areas as beneficial have to change to slow down urban migration. Social conditions, for instance, in urban areas that are not better than in rural areas

(Korte, 1980) are rarely considered by migrants. As a result, economically migrants can gain the benefit but with a socially high cost.

Finally, motives to migrate will grow continuously parallel with hierarchy of needs. Making a policy should anticipate the dynamic of motivation. As a consequence, prospective studies to await the next problem of migration are crucial and policy also has to settle the problem.

References

- Affandi, M. J. 1985. *Motivasi yang mendasari niat untuk bertransmigrasi*. Tesis S2 Program Studi Kependudukan, Fakultas Pasca Sarjana, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta.
- Cebula, R. J. and R. K. Vedder. 1973. "A note on migration, economic opportunity, and the quality of life" *Journal of Regional Science*, 13(2): 205-211.
- Clark, W. A. V. and E. G. Moore. 1982. "Residential mobility and public program: current gaps between theory and practice" *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(3): 35-50.
- De Jong, G. F. and J. T. Fawcett. 1981. "Motivation for migration: an assessment and a value-expectancy research model" in G. F. De Jong and R. W. Gardner, eds., *Migration decision making process: multidisciplinary approaches to microlevel studies in developed and developing countries*. New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 13-58.
- Fawcett, J. T. 1986. "Migration psychology: new behavioral model", *Population and Environment*, 8(1): 5-14.
- Fishbein, M. and I. Ajzen. 1975. *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behaviour: an Introduction to Theory and Research*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Fuller, T. D. et al. 1985. "Rural-urban mobility in Thailand: a decision-making approach", *Demography*, 22(4): 565-579.
- Haberkorn, G. 1981. "The migration decision-making process: some social-psychological considerations", in G. F. De Jong and R. W. Gardner, eds., *Migration Decision Making Process*:

- Multidisciplinary Approaches to Microlevel Studies in Developed and Developing Countries*. New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 252-280.
- Hsieh, C. and B. Liu. 1983. "The pursuance of better quality of life: in the long run, better quality of social life is the most important factor in migration", *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 42(4): 431-440.
- Hugo, G. J. 1987. "Demographic and welfare implication of urbanization: direct and indirect effects on sending and receiving areas", in R. J. Fuchs, et al., eds., *Urbanization and Urban Policies in Pacific Asia*. Boulder: Westview.
- Janis, I. L. and L. Mann. 1977. *Decision-making: a Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choice, and Commitment*. New York: Free Pres.
- Korten, C. 1980. "Urban and non-urban differences in social behaviour and social psychological models of urban impact", *Journal of Social Issues*, 36(3): 29-51.
- Lewin, K. 1935. *A Dynamic Theory of Personality*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lewis, G. J. 1982. *Human Migration: a Geographical Perspectives*.
- Liu, B. 1975. "Differential net migration rates and the quality of life", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 329-337, August.
- Maslow, A. H. 1973. "A theory of human motivation", *Psychological Review*, 50: 370-393.
- Mazumdar, D. 1987. "Rural-to-urban migration and labour markets" in R. J. Fuchs, et al., eds., *Urbanization and Urban Policies in Pacific Asia*. Boulder: Westview.
- Rhoda, R. E. 1983. "Rural development and urban migration: can we keep them down o the farm?", *International Migration Review*, 17(1): 34-64.
- Ritchey, P. N. 1976. "Explanation of migration", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2: 363-404.

- Rossi, P. H. and A. B. Shlay. 1982. "Residential mobility and public policy issues: 'Why families move' revisited", *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(3): 21-34.
- Winchie, D. B. and D. W. Carment. 1988. "Intention to migrate: a psychological analysis", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 18(9): 727-736.
- United Nations. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1980. *Patterns of Urban and Rural Population Growth*. New York.
- World Bank. 1984. *World Development Report*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yap, L. Y. L. 1977. "The attraction of cities", *Journal of Development Economics*, 4: 292-246.