

Research Report Series
No. 102

Factors Influencing Migration to Urban Areas in Pakistan
- A Case Study of Peshawar City -

Prepared by
Board of Economic Enquiry
North West Frontier Province
University of Peshawar

Pakistan Institute of Development Economic
Post Box No. 1091, Islamabad

FOREWORD

This report on factors affecting migration to Peshawar City is the second in the series of such case studies being done under the auspices of the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics. The first report provides a similar analysis in respect of Gujranwala City. These studies are based on a sample survey of each selected city. The survey of each city is supplemented by a survey of infrastructure of its adjacent rural areas.

It is hoped that the contents of this report and other similar reports would be useful to the policy makers and planners in understanding the role of various social and economic factors which influence people to leave their place of original residence in order to live in cities.

The survey and the writing of the present report were done by the North West Frontier Province Board of Economic Enquiry, Peshawar.

The Pakistan Institute of Development Economics appreciates the effort made by the staff of Board of Economic Enquiry, for this undertaking, particularly those of its Director Dr. Nurul-Islam Mian who invested a great deal of his time for getting the report re-written in the light of the comments and suggestions given by the PIDE research staff. Mr. Mohammad Ahmed Khan, Research Economist at the Board of Economic Enquiry was primarily responsible for the preparation of this report.

M. L. Qureshi
Director
Pakistan Institute of
Development Economics
Islamabad

Islamabad
September 1977

CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter 1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
Objective	1
Methodology	2
Conceptual Clarifications	6
Chapter 2. <u>MIGRANTS AND THEIR PLACE OF PREVIOUS RESIDENCE</u>	7
Number of Households	7
Expected Duration of stay	9
Place of Previous Residence	10
Chapter 3. <u>CHARACTERISTICS OF MIGRANTS</u>	12
Household size	12
Age Sex Distribution	12
Marital Status	15
Literacy	15
Level of Education	19
Working Status of Population	19
Employment Level	23
Income	23
Remittance to and from Home	27
Occupations	28
Type of working	28
Tenure Status	31
Chapter 4. <u>FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IN-MIGRATION TO PESHAWAR</u>	32
Reasons for Leaving Previous place of Residence	32
Economic Factors	32
Non-economic Factors	33
Reasons for Coming to Peshawar.	35

Reason for Seclection of Peshawar by In-Migrants	37
Chapter 5. <u>THE RURAL AREAS OF PESHAWAR DISTRICT</u>	41
Communication and Transport	44
Post Office and School	47
Banking and Credit	47
Electricity	47
Medical Facility	47
Major Occupation	49
Employment Level	49
Cottage Industries	50
Land and Crops	51
Out Migration	51
Chapter 6. <u>OUT MIGRATION FROM PESHAWAR CITY</u>	52
Reasons of Out-Migration	52
Characteristics of Out-Migrants	57
Age Distribution	59
Marital Status	59
Literacy Education	62
Working Status	62
Income	64
Chapter 7. MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	67
Appendices	71
<u>LIST OF VILLAGES</u>	72
<u>QUESTIONNAIRES USED IN THE PESHAWAR SURVEY</u>	77
<u>QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ON THE SAMPLE VILLAGES</u>	78
Appendix: Tables	82-91

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The rapid concentration of Population in large cities during the recent decades has been a striking feature of the urbanization process in Pakistan. The growth of Population in cities is to a large extent contributed by in-migration either from rural areas or from other urban areas. In view of the fact that the rate of natural increase of population is already very high, the additional growths due to migration have been causing disproportionate increases in the growth rate of urban population in comparison to the absorption capacity of industrial units, trade and other urban social services. Internal migration has not only been considered as a major contributing factor to the urban unemployment and under-employment but also as a drain of valuable human capital from the rural areas.

In view of the important role of migration in the social and economic development process, an understanding of the factors affecting internal migration to urban areas is considered important for the formulation of appropriate policies regarding population redistribution within the country.

Objective

The present study was assigned to the Board of Economic Enquiry, N.W.F.P., by the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics as a part of a series of such studies entitled "Factors Affecting Urbanisation in Pakistan". Its main focus is on the extent, nature, and causes of in-migration to the areas in the

jurisdiction of the Peshawar Municipality (henceforth interchangeably called the City, the Peshawar city, Peshawar). Peshawar, though the biggest and the most congested urban centre in NWFP, has been growing at a declining rate. Therefore, the study's scope was extended also to include out-migration from the city. The time reference of the study is the period commencing after the 1961 census and ending in July 1974. In pursuing the main objective of the study, i.e., to identify the factors which influence people to migrate to Peshawar city, an attempt was made to collect relevant data on in-migrants in respect of the following:

- a) Places of original residence
- b) Causes of migration
- c) Characteristics of migrants

In addition, the following information in respect of out-migrants was also collected.

- a) Causes of out-migration.
- b) Destination of out-migrants.
- c) Characteristics of out-migrants.

Methodology

The study is based on a sample survey of migrants in Peshawar city supplemented by a survey of selected villages with regard to their infrastructure.

In order to draw the sample for the Peshawar city survey lists of property units maintained by the Excise and Taxation Department were used as the sampling frame. This department has divided the city into 16 wards, which were grouped into five sectors for the purpose of the survey. The grouping was done in consultation with the Taxation Department according to homogeneity and contiguity of the wards.

The sample of 2488 property units, forming 5 percent of the total of 49,766 property units in the city, was allocated to each sector in proportion to its size. The allocated sample was drawn using the random number tables.

Table I

TOTAL PROPERTY UNITS IN PESHAWAR CITY
AND NUMBER OF UNITS SELECTED FOR SURVEY

S.N.	Sector Number	Total property Units	Sample Units	
			Number	Percent of Total
1.	I	19,673	533	5.00
2.	II	12,068	603	5.00
3.	III	9,433	472	5.00
4.	IV	5,000	250	5.00
5.	V	12,592	630	5.00
6.	All Sectors	49,766	2488	5.00

The Excise and Taxation Department does not maintain separate lists of residential and non-residential units. Therefore, in the sample got included the non-residential units as well. These constituted 32.23 per cent of the sample as shown in table 2.

Table-2

CLASSIFICATION OF SAMPLE UNITS BY RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL UNITS.

S.No.	Type of property units	No.	Percent
1.	All types	2488	100.00
2.	Residential	1686	67.77
3.	Non-residential	802	32.23

The non-residential units comprised of commercial/industrial units (shops, garrages, factories etc;), open plots, mosques, and dilapidated houses. The assumption is that their share in total property units would be the same as in the sample. Thus, the representation of residential units is not affected by their inclusion of non-residential one in the sample.

All but 18 of the 1686 residential *sample* units were contacted and response was achieved from their occupants.

Table-3

TOTAL AND THE ACHIEVED SAMPLE OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS

S.No.	Particulars	Number	Percent
1.	Total sample residential	1686	100.00
2.	Units contacted	1668	98.93
3.	Units not contacted	18	1.07

Of the 18 units under reference 17 were vacant. And one was locked. Its occupant was not expected back for some months

In order to secure an understanding of the "push" factors operating in rural areas, a sample was drawn of 30 villages representing approximately 5 percent of the total villages in the Peshawar District. Village list was taken from the District Census (1961) report. The villages in the different Tehsils of the district were given a continuous serial number, and selection

was randomised from the district as a whole and not the different Tehsils taken separately. Table 4 below shows the total sample and its distribution over the different Tehsils.

Table 4

TOTAL AND SAMPLE VILLAGES IN PESHAWAR
DISTRICT

S.No.	Locality	Number of Villages.	
		Total	Sample
1.	Peshawar Tehsil	252	15
2.	Charsadda "	197	7
3.	Nowshera "	139	8
4.	Total = Peshawar District	588	30

(list of sample villages given in appendix-I)

The "Baiy Chiragh" un-inhabited villages are not included in the total given in the above table.

Questionnaires in Peshawar city were filled up by the Board's staff who paid door to door visits. The questionnaire was in the urdu language (its english version forms Appendix-II). The interviewers were issued written instructions, in urdu. The questionnaire (No. 2) used for collection of data about the sample villages forms part of the Appendix-II. These questionnaires were filled up by the survey staff with the help of 'Patwaris', school teachers, and other persons in the sample villages.

Conceptual Clarifications

i-In-Migrants

For the purpose of this study an in-migrant was the person who satisfied the following conditions:-

- a. Had moved into Peshawar after the 1961 census but before 1st August, 1974.
- b. Had been in Peshawar for at least one year ending July 31, 1974;
- c. Had been in the City for less than one year upto July 31, 1974 but his total stay was expected to be of at least one year's duration.

ii. Out-Migrants

Persons satisfying the following conditions were taken as out-migrants:-

- a. Left the City before 1st August, 1974, and had been away for one year or more.
- b. Had been away for less than one year but intended to stay out for total period of one or more than one year.

iii. Local Population

The term local population has been used for the people living in Peshawar since before the 1961 census.

MIGRANTS AND THEIR PLACE OF PREVIOUS RESIDENCE

The total number of persons living in 1668 housing units which could be contacted out of the sample was 12,593. Out of these 1,227 persons were either themselves migrants (after 1961) or the children born to them subsequently. The rest consisted of those who were born in Peshawar, those who migrated before 1961 and their respective children. The break up of all the persons in the contacted housing units by migratory status is provided in Table 5.

Number of Households:

The total number of households residing in 1668 housing units was 2260. Of these 1978 had been in Peshawar prior to 1961 census and the remaining 282 came after 1961 census but before July 31, 1974. These 282 households were treated as migrants households in this study and analysis in respect of such households would be provided mostly, in terms of the number of household heads.

Table 6 provides the distribution of household-heads by years of in-migration to Peshawar. The table indicates an increasing trend of in-migrants over the years, particularly since 1970. Out of all the migrants who moved to Peshawar city over the years 1971-74, the proportion coming since 1970 was about 44 percent. One possible reason for this rise could be the re-establishment of Peshawar as provincial capital after the dissolution of the one Unit.

Table-5

SAMPLE POPULATION BY MIGRANT STATUS

Sr No.	Migratory Status	Number			Percent		
		Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes
1.	Born and living in Peshawar since before 1961 census	4765	4419	9184	71.79	74.19	72.93
2.	Moved into Peshawar before 1961 but not born there	545	390	935	8.22	6.55	7.43
3.	Children born to person at No. 1 and 2	688	559	1247	10.37	9.34	9.90
4.	Migrated to Peshawar after 1961 census	528	459	987	7.95	7.07	7.84
5.	Children born to post- 1961 census in-migrant (No.4)	111	129	240	1.67	2.17	1.90
6.	All categories	6637	5956	12593	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table-6

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS BY YEARS OF IN-MIGRATION

S.No.	Year of in-migration	Number	Percent
1.	1961	5	1.77
2.	1962	16	5.67
3.	1963	14	4.97
4.	1964	27	9.58
5.	1965	16	5.67
6.	1966	22	7.80
7.	1967	16	5.67
8.	1968	15	5.32
9.	1969	28	9.93
10.	1970	28	9.93
11.	1971	26	9.22
12.	1972	22	7.80
13.	1973	29	10.29
14.	1974 (upto 31.7.74)	18	6.38
Total		282	100.00

Expected duration of Stay

The survey also collected information on the years of expected stay from the migrant household heads. This information is portrayed in table 7.

About 38 percent of household heads stated that they intended to live in Peshawar for ever (Table 7). Another 39 percent had not yet made a decision in this respect. Also about 10 percent of the household head who did not respond can be placed in this category (of the undecided ones).

A little over 10 percent^{of} respondents, being on transferable jobs, could not specify the period of their expected stay. Only about 3 percent specified the period. Most of them stated it to be over 10 years.

Of the in-migrants classified in Table 7 by their expected stay in Peshawar, those in serial numbers 1 and 6 forming 48.02 percent of the total, can be treated as permanent in-migrants. Categories number 2 to 4, forming 2.07 percent of the total, belong to semi-permanent class. And the rest, 49.11 percent are cases of temporary in-migration.

As gathered from interviews with the in-migrants and also the local population, Peshawar constantly experiences population inflows and outflows. The city serves as a temporary halting station to a large number of in-migrants on their way to other urban centres, mostly outside the Province. The out-gone are replaced by the next streams of in-comers. Fortunately for the city, the rate of such replacement is on the decline.

EXPECTED STAY OF IN-MIGRANT HOUSEHOLD
HEADS IN PESHAWAR CITY

S.No.	Period of expected Stay	Number	Percent
1.	For ever	105	37.63
2.	More than 10 years	4	1.43
3.	5 to 10 years	2	0.72
4.	1 to 5 years	2	0.72
5.	Undecided	110	39.43
6.	Not known; post transferable	29	10.39
7.	No idea	13	6.45
8.	Not reported	9	3.23
9.	Total	279	100.00

Place of Previous Residence

In migrants to Peshawar come mainly from within the NWFP and the adjoining tribal areas. As will be seen from Table 8, 75.58 percent of the in-migrants had been living in other parts of NWFP and 11.55 percent in the adjoining tribal areas before shifting to Peshawar city.

Among all the districts in Pakistan, Peshawar district has been the principal source of in-migration accounting for 47.11 per cent of all in-migrants. The other important areas are the districts of Mardan and Kohat showing corresponding figures of 9.02 percent and 5.97 percent respectively. The districts of Swat, Dir and Chitral, covered by the Malakand Division, accounted for 3.11 percent.

Table-8

PLACE OF PREVIOUS RESIDENCE OF IN-MIGRANTS

S.No.	Place of Previous residence	Household Head only		All In-Migrants	
		No.	Percent	No.	Percent
I.	<u>N.W.F.P.</u>	<u>215</u>	<u>76.24</u>	<u>746</u>	<u>75.58</u>
1.	Hazara District	11	3.90	23	2.33
2.	Mardan "	30	10.54	89	9.02
3.	Peshawar "	114	40.54	465	47.11
4.	Kohat "	19	5.54	59	5.97
5.	D.I.Khan "	3	1.05	12	1.22
6.	Bannu "	4	1.41	13	1.32
7.	Sawat "	14	4.96	33	3.34
8.	Dir "	7	2.43	27	2.74
9.	Chatral "	13	4.51	29	2.93
II.	<u>Tribal Areas</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>8.15</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>11.55</u>
1.	Malakand "	-	-	19	1.92
2.	Mahmand Agency	16	5.67	80	8.11
3.	Khyber "	6	2.13	14	1.42
4.	North Waziristan	1	0.35	1	0.10
5.	South "	-	-	-	-
III.	<u>Punjab Province</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>8.51</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>6.59</u>
1.	Campbellpur "	12	4.26	27	2.75
2.	Rawalpindi "	2	0.71	10	1.01
3.	Jhelum "	-	-	1	0.10
4.	Gujrat "	1	0.36	2	0.20
5.	Sargodha "	4	1.41	7	0.71
6.	Lahore "	2	0.71	10	1.01
7.	Gujranwala "	1	0.35	2	0.20
8.	Sialkot "	2	0.71	7	0.71
IV	<u>Sind Province</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0.72</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0.71</u>
1.	Hyderabad "	1	0.36	2	0.20
2.	Karachi "	1	0.36	5	0.51
V	<u>Baluchistan</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1.06</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>1.22</u>
1.	Quetta "	3	1.06	12	1.22
VI	<u>Azad Kashmir</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0.71</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0.30</u>
VII	<u>Other Country</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>4.60</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>3.95</u>
i	Bangladesh	1	0.36	10	1.01
ii	Afghanistan	10	3.33	26	2.64
iii	Tanzania	1	0.36	3	0.30
	All places	282	100.00	987	100.00

CHARACTERISTICS OF MIGRANTS

Household Size

The average household size of the migrants to Peshawar city was 4.3. Compared to this the corresponding average for the non-migrants was 5.4. The lower average for the migrants is due to the large proportion of single member households among the migrants. A comparative picture of the distribution of migrant and non-migrant households by the number of persons in the household is provided in Table 9. The table shows that the percentage of one person households is 33 among migrants and 6 among non-migrants. On the other hand the households with 5 or more persons were about 33 percent among the migrants and 64 percent among the non-migrants. These results are supportive of the general hypothesis that the migrants first move to the city alone and their dependents or families come afterwards.

Age-Sex Distribution

Table 10 gives age distribution of all in-migrants and the household heads separately. The single largest concentration of in-migrant household heads is seen in the age-group 25-29 accounting for 16.67 percent. The next higher group, follows with 15.25 percent.

The younger groups are relatively more heavily represented in the in-migrant population than the middle and older ones. Thus, as will be seen from Table 10, household heads aged upto 34 accounted for 46.81 percent of the total. Those in age group 35-49 accounted for 31.91 percent. The next higher one, 50-59, claimed 11.71 percent. Persons above age 60 made up the balance of 9.57 percent.

Table-9

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY NUMBER OF PERSONS

S.No.	Number of Persons in the household	Number of households					
		All		Non-Migrants		In-Migrants	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
1.	One member house- hold	215	9.51	122	6.17	93	32.98
2.	Two " "	158	6.69	135	6.63	23	8.16
3.	Three " "	232	10.27	207	10.47	25	8.87
4.	Four " "	239	12.79	254	12.64	35	12.41
5.	Five " "	239	12.39	257	12.99	23	8.16
6.	Six " "	293	12.96	269	13.60	24	8.52
7.	Seven " "	253	11.42	239	12.08	19	6.74
8.	Eight " "	222	9.82	205	10.37	17	6.03
9.	Nine " "	110	4.87	98	4.96	12	4.26
10.	Ten " "	61	2.70	53	2.93	3	1.07
11.	Eleven " "	53	2.34	52	2.63	1	.35
12.	Twelve " "	27	1.23	25	1.26	2	0.70
13.	Thirteen " "	21	0.93	20	1.01	1	0.35
14.	Fourteen " "	11	0.41	11	0.56	-	-
15.	Fifteen " "	9	0.40	8	0.04	1	0.35
16.	Sixteen " "	4	0.18	4	0.02	-	-
17.	Seventeen " "	5	0.26	5	0.25	1	0.35
18.	Eighteen " "	4	0.18	4	0.02	-	-
19.	Nineteen " "	3	0.13	3	0.15	-	-
20.	Twenty " "	1	0.04	1	0.02	-	-
21.	Twenty one " "	1	0.04	1	0.02	-	-
22.	Twenty two " "	2	0.09	-	-	2	0.70
Total		2260	100.00	1978	100.00	282	100.00

Despite a relatively larger proportion of one-person households among the migrants their sex ratio did not indicate a relatively higher proportion of males as compared to non-migrants. This is clearly indicated by the corresponding sex ratios of migrants and non-migrants, which came out to be 109 and 113 respectively.

Marital Status

The proportion of un-married among the migrants was lower than among those who were non-migrants, being 54 percent and 60 percent for the two groups respectively. Table 11 indicates that among the female migrants the proportion married was higher than the corresponding proportion among the female non-migrants. This is indicative of marriage migration of females to Peshawar city.

Among the household heads (almost all males), the percentage of un-married was only 21 which indicates that most of the migrants are married whether they come alone to Peshawar or they come with dependants.

Literacy

The literacy status of migrants and non-migrants in Peshawar city is described in Table 12. The table shows that of those aged 5 and above in the sample population, whether migrants or non-migrants, 55 percent were literates. The literacy percentage was however, much higher for males (66%) than for females (44%).

Table 11
 MARITAL STATUS OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION

S.No.	Marital status	All in Migrants						Non - Migrants						In Migrant household Head					
		Male		Female		Both Sexes		Male		Female		Both Sexes		Male		Female		Both Sexes	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Never Married	363	57.00	297	51.00	660	54.00	3845	64.00	3076	57.00	6921	60.00	58	21.00	-	-	58	21.00
2.	Married	266	42.00	271	46.00	537	44.00	2090	35.00	1970	37.00	4060	36.00	215	77.00	2	67.00	217	77.00
3.	Widowed	9	1.00	20	3.00	29	2.00	52	1.00	315	6.00	367	4.00	6	2.00	1	33.00	7	2.00
4.	Divorced	1	-	-	-	1	-	5	-	4	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5.	Not Reported	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	3	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.	Total	639	100.0	588	100.0	1227	100.0	5998	100.0	5368	100.0	11366	100.0	279	100.0	3	100.0	282	100.00

Table 12

- 17 -

LITERACY STATUS OF THE POPULATION AGED 5 YEARS AND ABOVE

Sr. No.	Literacy Status	All In-Migrants		Household head of In-Migrants		Non-Migrants		All (Migrants + Non-Migrants)	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Literate:								
	Male	250	43.94	112	40.14	3389	68.19	3639	65.69
	Female	85	16.96	-	-	2090	46.97	2175	43.93
	Both Sexes	335	31.31	112	39.72	5479	58.16	5814	55.48
2.	Illiterate:-								
	Male	319	56.06	167	59.86	1581	31.81	1900	34.31
	Female	416	83.03	3	100.00	2360	53.03	2776	56.07
	Both Sexes	735	68.69	170	60.28	3941	41.84	4676	44.62
3.	Total (1 + 2)								
	Male	569	100.00	279	100.00	4970	100.00	5539	100.00
	Female	501	100.00	3	100.00	4450	100.00	4951	100.00
	Both Sexes	1070	100.00	282	100.00	9420	100.00	10490	100.00

Table - 13

-18-

LEVEL OF EDUCATION ACQUIRED BY THE LITERATE POPULATION (INCLUDING
PERSONS STILL AT SCHOOL)

S/No.	Highest Examination Passed	All Migrants						In-Migrant Household Heads						Non-Migrant Population					
		Male		Female		Both Sexes		Male		Female		Both Sexes		Male		Female		Both Sexes	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.	Under Primary (Grade 1 to 4)	49	17.20	25	20.4	68	20.29	2	1.78	-	-	2	1.78	586	24.74	303	32.96	969	27.44
2.	Primary to Under Middle Grade (5-7)	37	14.00	15	17.64	52	15.52	15	13.39	-	-	15	13.39	485	20.47	253	21.77	738	20.90
3.	Middle to Under Matric Grade (8-9)	47	10.00	14	16.47	61	18.21	16	14.29	-	-	16	14.29	444	10.74	222	19.10	666	18.06
4.	Matric but below Intermediate (10-11)	54	21.00	16	18.82	70	20.90	37	33.04	-	-	37	33.04	455	19.20	184	15.83	639	18.10
5.	Intermediate and Below Under Graduate (12-13)	26	10.40	6	7.06	32	9.55	17	15.18	-	-	17	15.18	211	8.91	60	5.16	271	7.67
6.	Graduate and below Post graduate	14	5.60	6	7.06	20	5.97	8	7.14	-	-	8	7.14	111	4.60	34	2.93	145	4.11
7.	Post Graduate Degree	9	3.60	1	1.18	10	2.99	9	8.04	-	-	9	8.04	30	1.27	7	0.60	37	1.05
8.	Professional Degree	10	4.00	-	-	10	2.99	5	4.45	-	-	5	4.45	25	1.06	3	0.27	28	0.79
9.	Post Matric diplomas	-	-	1	1.18	1	0.30	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	0.30	9	0.77	16	0.45
10.	Post B.L./M.L. Professional training (B.Ed./B.T.)	-	-	1	1.18	1	0.30	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.08	3	0.27	5	0.15
11.	L.S.M.F.	1	0.40	-	-	1	0.30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12.	Madrisa Education	9	3.60	-	-	9	2.66	3	2.68	-	-	3	2.68	13	0.55	4	0.34	17	0.48
Total		250	100.00	55	100.00	335	100.00	112	100.00	-	-	112	100.00	2369	100	1162	100	3531	100

A comparison of literacy of migrants and non-migrants shows that 68 percent of non-migrant males were literates as compared to 44 percent among the migrants. The literacy percentage for females was much lower (17 %) for migrants than for non-migrants (47%). These differences can be taken to represent the rural - urban differentials in literacy by sex.

Level of Education

The distribution of literates among the migrants and non-migrants by level of education attained is provided in Table 13. The table shows that out of literate migrants, 36 percent were educated to below middle level, while for the non-migrant literates the corresponding percentage was 48. This shows that the percentage of migrant literates who had completed middle or above level of education, was relatively higher than the corresponding percentage among the non-migrants. This indicates that a large proportion of migrants came to Peshawar for jobs requiring educated persons or they came for educational pursuits.

Working Status of Population Aged 10 and over.

Table 14 and 15 classify the total in-migrants and household heads respectively according to their working status before and after moving into Peshawar. The relevant summary statistics are given below:-

Table 14

CLASSIFICATION OF IN-MIGRANTS BY WORKING STATUS BEFORE AND AFTER
MIGRATION TO PESHAWAR

Sr. No.	Working Status	In Peshawar						Before coming to Peshawar					
		Male		Female		Both Sexes		Male		Female		Both Sexes	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Gainfully Employed	395	76.15	3	1.89	404	42.80	233	65.81	7	1.91	290	36.43
2.	Unemployed: looking for work	21	4.15	-	-	21	2.22	58	13.49	-	-	58	7.29
3.	Neither working nor looking for work	103	19.80	416	98.11	519	54.98	98	20.70	359	98.09	448	56.28
	i) Housewife (including girls aged 10+not going to school) doing home work.	-	-	375	88.44	375	39.72	-	-	332	90.71	332	71.70
	ii) Person aged 60+	6	1.15	5	1.18	11	1.16	2	0.46	3	0.82	5	0.62
	iii) Students	92	17.69	35	8.25	127	13.45	36	20.00	24	6.55	110	13.82
	iv) Pensioner	4	0.77	-	-	4	0.42	-	-	-	-	-	-
	v) Invalid	1	0.19	1	0.23	2	0.21	1	0.23	-	-	1	0.12
	Total	520	100.00	424	100.00	944	100.00	430	100.00	365	100.00	796	100.00

Table 15

-21-

WORKING STATUS OF THE IN-MIGRANTS HOUSEHOLD HEADS

Sr. No.	Working Status	Present					Before Migration						
		Number			%		Number			%			
		Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes
1.	Employed	264	-	264	93.55	100.00	93.61	213	3	216	75.34	100.00	76.59
2.	Unemployed: Looking for work	3	-	3	1.08	-	1.07	34	-	34	12.19	-	12.06
3.	Neither working nor looking for work	12	3	15	5.37	-	5.32	32	-	32	11.47	-	11.35
	i) Housewise	-	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
	ii) going to school	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	iii) Students (10+)	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	27	-	-	-
	iv) person aged 60 and over	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
	v) Pensioniers & Invalids	5	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
	Total	279	3	282	100.00	100.00	100.00	279	3	282	100.00	100.00	100.00

<u>Working Status</u>	<u>All in-migrants</u>		<u>Household heads only</u>	
	<u>In peshawar</u> %	<u>Previous</u> %	<u>In Peshawar</u> %	<u>Previous</u> %
-Gainfully Employed	42.80	36.43	93.55	76.59
-Looking for work	2.22	7.29	1.08	12.06
-Nither working nor looking for work	<u>54.98</u>	<u>56.28</u>	<u>5.37</u>	<u>11.35</u>
	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>

The category 'neither working nor looking for work' is comprised of housewives students, idle persons aged 60 and over, pensioners, and invalids. Of the 282 household heads 32 belonged to this category before they moved into Peshawar. The number fell to 15 afterwards because 24 persons who were previously students, joined the work force after coming into Peshawar, while of the previously employed ones went into retirement. Thus, the working population gained 17 new entrants to working groups in Peshawar.

The category 'neither working nor looking for work' includes 3 housewives and 3 students in post-migration period. This may be clarified. They were in Peshawar for reasons other than economic. They had been maintaining independent households and were by virtue of their actual and intended stay in Peshawar, eligible for inclusion in the in-migration category.

Returning to Table 14 and 15 it would be seen that activity rate of in-migrants in general as well as that of household heads improved after migration. It rose from 43.72 percent to 45.02 percent in the case of all in-migrants, and from 98.65 percent to 94.63 percent in the case of household heads.

Female participation in economic activity was negligible both before and after migration. Taking all in-migrating females as a whole, only 1.91 per cent were economically active before and 1.89 per cent after moving into Peshawar. The corresponding figures for males are 79.30 per cent and 80.30 per cent respectively.

Employment Level

Beside a rise in activity rate, the level of employment of the in-migrants improved too. From table 16, we find that of the economically active household heads, 86.40 per cent were employed before and 98.87 per cent after coming to Peshawar. The unemployment rate fell from 13.60 per cent to 1.13 per cent. In the case of the in-migrant (active) population as a whole, the unemployment rate dropped from 16.67 per cent to 4.94 per cent after migration.

The employed ones as suggested by their income data, appeared to be more fully employed in Peshawar than previously. This is especially true of those coming from rural areas.

Income.

The sample population's response to the question on income was most unsatisfactory. It is believed that they grossly understated their existing income. As regards their previous income, a large number of them either did not remember it or could not specify it in terms of money. Those who did state it, are believed to have erred on the high side. This applies particularly to those from rural areas. Notwithstanding these flaws, the data on their present and previous

Table 16
EMPLOYMENT LEVEL OF IN-MIGRANTS

Sr. No.	Employment status	Present				Before Migration							
		Number		Percent		Number		Percent					
		Male	Female	Both	Sexes	Male	Female	Both	Sexes				
A. Household Heads													
1.	Employed	264	-	264	93.37	-	93.37	213	3	216	85.23	100.00	86.40
2.	Unemployed (looking for work)	3	-	3	1.13	-	1.13	34	-	34	13.77	-	13.60
	Total	267	-	267	100.00	-	100.00	247	3	250	100.00	100.00	100.00
B. All Active In-Migrants													
1.	Employed	395	8	404	94.96	100.00	95.06	283	7	290	82.99	100.00	83.33
2.	Unemployed	21	-	21	5.04	-	4.94	58	-	58	17.01	-	16.67
	Total	417	8	425	100.00	100.00	100.00	341	7	348	100.00	100.00	100.00

income point to significant improvement in their income level after moving into Peshawar.

Prior to coming to Peshawar, 20 or 11.24 percent out of the 176 household heads who provided information on income, earned less than Rs. 50 a month. In the corresponding column for the post migration period i.e. after coming to Peshawar, there are, as will be seen from table 17, only two households heads forming 0.77 percent of the total. And we do not believe that these two household heads stated the fact when they said that they were earning less than Rs. 50 per month. A summarised versions of table 16 is given below for a comparative study of previous and present income of the household head.

<u>Monthly Income.</u>	<u>Percent of Household Heads</u>	
	<u>In Peshawar</u>	<u>Previous</u>
Upto Rs. 100	14.55	45.26
101-200	45.51	26.32
201-300	19.31	13.69
301-400	7.94	2.63
401-50	2.33	3.68
501 and above	10.31	8.42
<u>All Levels</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>

Due to inflation, the extent of improvement in economic well being of the population under study would not be as great as indicated by their comparative money income data given above. Allowing for the suspected under-reporting of income for post-migration period, there are, however, strong suggestions that the

Table 17

MONTHLY INCOME OF IN-MIGRANTS HOUSEHOLD
HEADS BEFORE AND AFTER COMING TO PESHAWAR.

S.No.	Monthly Income	In Peshawar		Previous	
		No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.	Less than 50	2	0.77	20	11.24
2.	51-100	15	5.77	65	36.52
3.	101-150	50	23.08	23	12.92
4.	151-200	60	23.08	22	12.36
5.	201-250	21	8.08	13	7.30
6.	251-300	39	15.00	10	5.62
7.	301-350	15	5.77	3	1.69
8.	351-400	11	4.23	2	1.13
9.	401-450	1	0.38	1	0.56
10.	451-500	6	2.31	5	2.81
11.	501-550	1	0.38	1	0.56
12.	551-600	9	3.46	1	0.56
13.	601-650	-	-	-	-
14.	651-700	-	-	2	1.12
15.	701-750	1	0.38	-	-
16.	751-800	3	1.15	2	1.12
17.	801-850	1	0.39	1	0.56
18.	851-900	1	0.38	-	-
19.	901-950	1	0.39	-	-
20.	951-1000	6	2.31	-	-
21.	1000 and above	7	2.69	7	3.93
22.	Facilities (food, accommodation)	-	-	-	-
23.	All groups	260	100.00	173	100.00

real income of the migrants did improve significantly after migration, despite inflation.

Remittances to and From Home:

Of the 279 primary movers, 53 or 19 percent had been sending money home after coming to Peshawar. Most of them (27), had been sending less than one hundred rupees a month. (table 18)

Table 18

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS BY MONEY SENT TO AND RECEIVED FROM HOME AFTER COMING TO PESHAWAR.

S.No.	Monthly remittance (Rupees)	Persons Sending Money		Persons Receiving Money	
		No.	%	No.	%
1.	Less than 100	27	9.63	12	4.30
2.	101-200	15	5.37	6	2.15
3.	201-300	5	1.79	-	-
4.	301-400	2	0.72	2	0.72
5.	401-500	2	0.72	-	-
6.	501 +	2	0.72	2	0.72
7.	None	216	77.42	250	89.60
8.	Not reported	10	3.58	7	2.51
Total		279	100.00	279	100.00

Only 22 or 7.89 percent of household heads concerned had been receiving money from home after moving into Peshawar. The majority of them, 12, received less than one hundred rupees a month. These and other recipients of money from home comprised mainly the persons who were un-employed and also these who were

not available for undertaking employment. This latter class includes students and others who came to Peshawar for reasons other than economic.

Occupations

Significant change in occupational composition of in-migrants took place due to migration. Prior to migration, the occupational group appearing in Table 19 under the head "Agriculture Animal Husbandary....." had the single largest concentration, 32.87 percent, of the workers (the employed household heads). This group's share fell to 2.65 percent after in-migration and the category of workers classified at no. 7 in table 19 as "Production and Related workers....." emerged as the single largest one with 31.82 percent of the workers.

Suming up, the Agriculture, Animal husbandry" group was the major losing group due to migration. The major gaining categories were (i) professional and technical workers, (ii) sales workers, (iii) service workers, and (iv) production workers.

Type of Housing

In Peshawar, 61.29 percent of the in-migrants lived in 'pucca' and 10.04 percent in semi-pucca houses. Before coming to Peshawar, only 22.58 percent of them lived in pucca and 23.30 percent in semi-pucca houses. (Table 20) It would, however, be misleading to construe from these statistics that they had been enjoying better living condition in Peshawar than previously. As seen during the course of the survey, most of the houses were

Table 19

CLASSIFICATION OF IN-MIGRANTS HOUSEHOLD
HEADS BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUP-PRESENT
AND BEFORE MIGRATION

S.No. Occupational Group	Present		Before Migration	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1. Professional, Technical and Related workers	19	7.19	5	2.32
2. Administrative and Related workers	11	4.17	9	4.17
3. Clerical and Related workers	34	12.83	21	9.72
4. Sales workers	66	25.00	31	14.35
5. Services workers	27	10.23	4	1.85
6. Agricultures, Animal Husbandry and Forestry workers, Fisherman and Hunters.	7	2.65	71	32.87
7. Production and related workers, Transport Equipment operators, and Labourers	84	31.82	53	24.54
8. Workers Not classified by occupation	8	3.03	7	3.24
9. Armed Forces Employees	8	3.03	15	6.94
Total	264	100.00	216	100.00

Table 20

Distribution of In-Migrant Household Heads

S.No.	Type of Houses	Before Migration		Present	
		No.	%	No.	%
1.	Pacca	63	22.58	171	61.29
2.	Semi-pacca	55	23.30	28	10.04
3.	Kucha	127	45.52	60	21.50
4.	Chapper/Hut	4	1.43	1	0.36
5.	Not reported	20	7.17	19	6.81
Total		279	100.00	279	100.00

Table 20 (a)

Distribution of In-Migrant Household Heads By Tenure Status of House

Sr. No.	Tenure Status	Before Migration		Present	
		No.	%	No.	%
1.	Owned	130	45.59	56	20.07
2.	Rented	78	27.96	166	59.50
3.	Neither owned nor rented	51	13.28	39	13.98
4.	Not reported	20	7.17	18	6.45
5.	All types	279	100.00	279	100.00

very small, in bad repair, not provided with proper amenities, and had highly insanitary surroundings. For the in-migrants from rural areas at least, the change in this respect did not appear to be for the better. In the villages, the houses are at least more spacious, if not better built, and placed in less incongenial surroundings than those in Peshawar.

Tenure Status

Most of the in-migrants (59.50 percent) lived in rented houses in Peshawar. (Table 20) A little over 20 percent of them owned the houses in which they were living in Peshawar, while about 14 percent lived in houses which were neither owned nor rented in by them. This latter category includes those who were living with their relatives, friends, or/and in rent-free houses provided by employers.

Of the houses in which the migrants lived before migration 46.59 percent were rented. The category of neither rented nor owned accounted for 18.28 percent, while the ownership status of 7.17 percent was not reported.

FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IN-MIGRATION TO PESHAWAR

to

In causing the population under study/leave their previous abodes and migrate to Peshawar, the push/factors played the dominant role and in the selection of Peshawar/ its nearness to migrants previous places of residence and also their better knowledge of opportunities in the City due to presence of friends and relatives in it, were the major determining factors.

Reason for Leaving previous Place of Residence

The response of the household heads to this question is given in Table 21 under seventeen different heads which can be sifted into three broad groups viz; (i) economic reasons and (ii) non-economic reasons and (iii) combination of the aforesaid two factors. Each of these groups admits further classification into (i) push factors, (ii) pull factors and (iii) non-discretionary migration; this latter category is introduced to cover the cases of transfer in service and marriage migrations. Among the reasons for leaving their previous abodes, economic factors were mentioned by 69.53 percent in-migrants. About 7 percent gave non-economic reasons, and the remaining 23.56 percent stated that they had left their previous abodes because of a combination of economic and non-economic factors (Table 21).

Economic Factors

Among the 134 respondents who attributed their migration to economic factors exclusively, 95 or 23.68 percent stated that they left their previous place of residence because their income was insufficient. Another 15 or 5.32 percent left because there were

no job opportunities for them after they had completed their education. Insufficiency of land was mentioned by 2.83 percent and absence of non-agricultural jobs by 5.32 percent respondents. One person left as he had suffered loss in business. In all 69 percent, the factors of migration were attributable to economic reasons.

Only 24 or 3.51 percent respondents stated that they left their previous places for better income prospects outside.

Migration due to transfers, retirement, and to join other migrants in the city (in cases of secondary mover) was reported in 35 cases. These formed 12.42 percent of total in-migrating households. They belong to non-discretionary migration category.

The push forces as suggested by the above given data, played the dominant role in causing the respondents to migrate. Further support to this suggestion is provided by the data on pre and post migration income level of in-migrants as given in Table 21.

Non-Economic Factors

Required educational facilities not available in the village8
Mal-adjustment with rural environment5
Prefer city life to rural life4
Marriage3
Other reasons1
	<u>21</u>

Table-21

REASONS FOR LEAVING THE PREVIOUS PLACE OF RESIDENCE

(In Migrant Household heads)

Sr. No.	Reasons	Male		Female		Both sexes	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
I.	<u>Economic Factors</u>	193	69.17	-	-	193	68.44
1.	No employment opportunities after education	15	5.37	-	-	15	5.32
2.	Insufficiency of land	8	2.87	-	-	8	2.83
3.	No safety for non-agricultured job	15	5.37	-	-	15	5.32
4.	Insufficient income	95	34.05	-	-	95	33.68
5.	Loss in business	1	0.36	-	-	1	0.35
6.	For better income prospects	24	8.60	-	-	24	8.51
7.	Transfer	30	10.75	-	-	30	10.65
8.	Retirement	2	0.72	-	-	2	0.70
9.	Secondary moves	3	1.7	-	-	3	1.07
II.	<u>Non-Economic Factors</u>	20	7.17	3	100.00	21	7.44
1.	Required educational facilities not available	8	2.87	-	-	8	2.83
2.	Prefer city life over rural life	4	1.44	-	-	4	1.42
3.	Marriage	3	1.07	-	-	3	1.07
4.	Religions factors	1	0.36	-	-	1	0.35
5.	Mal-adjustment with rural environment	4	1.44	1	33.33	5	1.87
III.	<u>Combination of different factors.</u>	66	23.66	2	66.67	68	24.12
IV.	All Factors	279	100.00	3	100.00	282	100.00

The ranking of the different non-economic factors of migration, as above, is more or less in line with the common knowledge on the subject. Lack of good educational facilities, and incongenial living conditions in rural areas are too well known to need a comment here. These serve as strong push factors culminating in migration if the affected ones have means to break away from rural life.

Mal-adjustment with rural environment is another equally important push factor. The five cases falling in this category are of the in-migrant household heads who were forced to leave their villages due to enmity.

Reasons for Coming to Peshawar.

In order to identify the pull factors and also to serve as a check question, the in-migrating household heads were asked to specify the reasons for coming to Peshawar. The response pattern was quite consistent with their statement of push factors discussed in the previous section (table 22). In Peshawar, they either found a solution to the problems faced by them in their previous abodes or hoped to find one. The respondents mentioned 17 different reasons for coming to Peshawar. Here the in-migrants were more clear and specific than in their response to the question as to reasons for leaving their previous abodes. In the latter case, 193 of them specified economic reasons, 21 gave non-economic reasons, while 69 stated a combination of these two. On the other hand in response to the former question (why they came to Peshawar), economic reasons were stated by 231, non-economic by 15, and a combination of these two by 36. This statement of

Table 22

-36-

REASON FOR COMING TO PESHAWAR

(Migrant Household Heads)

S.No.	Reason for coming	Number			Percent		
		Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes
1.	Got a job in a Factory	19	-	19	6.81	-	6.75
2.	Came for business	59	-	59	21.15	-	20.92
3.	Came for Govt/ private service	70	-	70	25.09	-	24.82
4.	For education	5	-	5	1.79	-	1.77
5.	For apprenticeship	15	-	15	5.38	-	5.32
6.	Proper city life to village life	4	-	4	1.43	-	1.42
7.	Marriage	3	-	3	1.08	-	1.06
8.	Better Medical faci- lities	-	-	-	-	-	-
9.	Expected more income	4	-	4	1.43	-	1.42
10.	Secondary Movers	3	-	3	1.08	-	1.06
11.	Transfer	30	-	30	10.75	-	10.64
12.	Retirement	2	-	2	0.72	-	0.71
13.	Piri Murede	1	-	1	0.36	-	0.35
14.	Ma adjustment with rural environment	1	1	2	0.36	33.33	0.71
15.	Death of spouse	-	-	-	-	-	-
16.	Expected better employment opper- tunities	29	-	29	10.38	-	10.28
17.	Combination of causes	34	2	36	12.19	66.67	12.77
		279	3	282	100.00	100.00	100.00

reasons can be accepted as more objectively explaining the reasons for leaving the previous place than the response pattern emerging from the question discussed in the previous section.

The single largest number of in-migrants 24.8 percent of the total came to Peshawar for Government and private jobs. This does not include cases of transfer, but is inclusive of persons who came after arranging a job in the city and also those who came in the hopes of getting one.

The next largest category is of those who came for business. They numbered 59 or 20.9 percent of the total. Another 10.6 percent came as they had been transferred (in service) to Peshawar, and 10.3 percent came in the hope of better employment opportunities. This latter group had not arranged a job in advance of moving into the city.

About 7 percent ^{of the} respondents came as they got job in factories. These appear to be cases of pre-arranged employment. A little over 5 percent respondents came for learning some trade as apprentices. Expectation of higher income was stated as a reason ^{of the} for in-migration by 1.42 percent/respondents.

Reasons for Selection of Peshawar By In-migrants

Why especially peshawar was selected by in Migrants? Table 23 gives their replies to this question. The most mentioned reason was that of Peshawar being the nearest city to respondent's villages. This was stated by 27.9 percent household heads. Another 19.3 percent were encouraged to move into Peshawar because their friends and/or relatives were already in the city. The presence

Table 23

REASONS FOR SELECTION OF PESHAWAR BY IN-MIGRANT
HOUSEHOLD HEADS

S.No.	Reasons	Number of			Percent		
		Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes
1.	Friends/Relatives Already in Peshawar	53	1	54	19.20	33.33	19.35
2.	Fellow villagers in Peshawar	43	-	43	15.58	-	15.58
3.	Peshawar is nearest to respondent's village	77	1	78	27.90	33.33	27.95
4.	Transfer in service	28	-	28	10.15	-	10.15
5.	Secondary Movers	1	1	2	0.36	33.33	0.71
6.	Combination of 1+2+3 reasons	13	-	13	4.71	-	4.67
7.	Got a job here	35	-	35	12.68	-	12.55
8.	To look for a job	13	-	13	4.71	-	4.67
9.	No specific reason	13	-	13	4.71	-	4.67
Total		276	3	279	100.00	100.00	100.00

of fellow villagers in the city prompted 15.6 percent respondents to follow the suit. Thirteen or about 5 percent respondents mentioned a combination of the aforestated three factors.

A total of 35 or 12.5 Percent respondents came because they got a job, 28 or 10 percent were transfer cases, 13 or 4.7 percent came in search for jobs, and an equal number had no specific reason to state.

A fairly large proportion, 41.58 percent of the in-migrants possessed prior information about employment opportunities in Peshawar (table 24). The main sources of information were their relatives and fellow villagers (table 25).

Table 24

HOUSEHOLD HEADS BY PRIOR INFORMATION ABOUT
EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN PESHAWAR

S.No.	Prior information	Number			Percent		
		Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes
1.	Yes	115	1	116	41.67	33.33	41.58
2.	No.	161	2	163	58.33	66.67	58.42
	All	276	3	276	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 25

HOUSEHOLD HEAD BY SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT
EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN PESHAWAR

S.No.	Informing Person	Number			Percent		
		Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes
1.	Friends	9	-	9	7.83	-	7.75
2.	Relatives	5	1	46	39.13	100	39.68
3.	Some one from village	35	-	35	30.44	-	30.17
4.	Any other person	26	-	26	22.60	-	22.41
Total		115	1	116	100.00	100	100.00

THE RURAL AREAS OF PESHAWAR DISTRICT

In a previous chapter we saw that of the in-migrants to the Peshawar city, 66.46 percent hailed from rural areas, and of the latter, those of the Peshawar District accounted for 54 percent. We also found that the overwhelming majority of these had left previous abodes because of inhospitable economic conditions there. In order to secure a closer and better view of the rural infrastructure a sample of 30 villages was surveyed in the Peshawar District. The main purpose of the survey was to seek information that would help to know, why the rural folk flock in large number to urban centres. The findings are given in this chapter.

What the survey of rural area reveals, substantiates the in-migrants reports of the inhospitable economic conditions

there. Stated in brief, the rural areas are heavily dependent on agriculture for income and employment. This sector has, however, already exhausted its manpower absorption capacity. The population is on the other hand increasing fast. In such a situation one would look to the non-agricultural sector for absorbing the new entrants to the labour market. But this sector had very little to offer in this respect. No mentionable advance was made in cottage and small industries. Some noticeable development had, however, taken place in trade and commerce. However, rural sector of to-day appears to be more lively than that of a decade ago. This is particularly true of the rural areas lying close to Peshawar and other urban centres in the district. But

despite the up rising in its growth during the past few years, the rural sector is unable to fully absorb the growing number of new entrants to the labour force. This is symptomised in the large number of wholly and under-employed people in these areas, a situation which is the most important cause of rural to urban migration. There does not appear to be any hope of reversing of this outflow unless the underlying factors are controlled.

Many people, particularly those who have not lived in villages, have a great liking for the country life. But in actual fact there is nothing much romantic about it. There is almost complete absence of medical facilities & educational facilities are extremely short in supply and poor in quality. No arrangements exist for sanitation. Nor are they all provided with proper communication and transport facilities. Though the condition of these things is much better these days than a decade ago, yet the village life is full of ordeal which few are sorry to break away from. With these general observations the survey's findings are presented as follows.

According to the 1972 Census, the population of sample villages was 71,837 which exceeded their 1961 population of 43,033 by 66.93 percent. (Table 26) In 1961, as many as 12 out of the sample villages had a population of 500 or less. The corresponding number was 6 in 1972 (table 27). The population density was 0.82 per acre in 1961, which increased to 1.38 in 1972.

Most of the sample villages are located at easy distances from the Peshawar city. As will be seen from table 28, ten of these are within ten miles distance from Peshawar. Another 3 villages

Table 26

POPULATION OF THE SAMPLE VILLAGES IN PESHAWAR DISTRICT

Year	Male		Female		Both sexes (=100.00)
	No.	%	No.	%	
1961	22620	52.56	20413	47.44	43033
1972	35589	52.32	34248	47.68	71837
Variation over 1961					66.93

Table 27

SAMPLE VILLAGES CLASSIFIED BY POPULATION SIZE

S.No.	Population	1961	1972
1.	Upto 500	12	6
2.	501-1000	6	6
3.	1001-1500	5	3
4.	1501-2000	2	4
5.	2001-2500	1	3
6.	2501-3000	-	-
7.	3001-4000	3	2
8.	4001-5000	1	2
9.	5001 and above	2	4
Total		30	30

Table 28

SAMPLE VILLAGES BY DISTANCE FROM PESHAWAR CITY

S.No.	Distance (Miles)	No.	Percent
1.	Upto 5	3	10.00
2.	5 to 10	7	23.33
3.	10 to 15	8	26.67
4.	15 to 20	3	10.00
5.	20 to 25	3	10.00
6.	25 to 30	2	6.67
7.	30 to 35	1	3.33
8.	35 to 40	2	6.67
9.	40 to 45	-	-
10.	45 to 50	-	-
11.	50 to 55	-	-
12.	55 to 60	-	3.33
Total		30	100.00

are at a distance of 10 to 15 miles. The remaining lie beyond 15 miles; but none beyond 60.

Communication and Transport

A fairly large number of the sample villages is connected with Peshawar through metalled roads, and railways plus metalled roads. As will be seen from Table 29 eleven of these are connected with Peshawar through metalled roads only, and four have railways plus metalled roads leading to Peshawar. The remaining 15 have road connections, partly metalled and partly un-metalled.

Railway stations are located within five miles distance in nine of the selected villages. At the other extreme, these are located beyond 15 miles in case of 10 villages (Table 30). The villagers, however, normally prefer the road transport even where a railway station is close by.

Approach roads from the sample villages to the nearest railway stations are all metalled in the case of 11 villages, entirely unmetalled in three cases, and partly metalled and partly unmetalled in 16 cases (Table 31).

Regarding the type of approach roads to the main road leading to Peshawar, the position is that there are unmetalled in 16 out of 30 villages. Only 9 villages have metalled approach roads.

Buses and non-mechanical vehicles are the most widely used means of outbound transport (table 32). Sixteen of the sample villages employ this means. In six villages only the buses, and in an equal number only the non-mechanical vehicles (tonga, bullock cart) are the main means of transportation. Only two villages

Table 29

SAMPLE VILLAGES BY WAY OF CONNECTION WITH
PESHAWAR CITY

Sr. No.	Way connected with Peshawar City	No.	Percent.
1.	Railway only	-	-
2.	Railway and metalled roads	4	13.33
3.	Metalled roads	11	36.67
4.	Metalled roads as well as unmetalled roads	15	50.00
5.	Unmetalled roads only	-	-
Total		30	100.00

Table 30

SAMPLE VILLAGES BY DISTANCE OF NEAREST RAILWAY
STATION

S.No.	Distance (Miles)	Number	Percent
1.	Less than 1 miles	4	13.33
2.	1 to 3 miles	3	10.00
3.	3 to 5 miles	2	6.67
4.	5 to 7 miles	4	13.33
5.	7 to 9 miles	3	10.00
6.	9 to 11 miles	1	3.33
7.	11 to 13 miles	1	3.33
8.	13 to 15 miles	2	6.67
9.	over 15 miles	10	33.34
Total		30	100.00

-5-
Table 31

TYPE OF APPROACH ROAD FROM SAMPLE VILLAGES TO
NEAREST RAILWAY STATION AND TO MAIN ROAD LEADING
TO PESHAWAR

S.No.	Road Type	Road leading to			
		Nearest Railway Station		Metalled Road to Peshawar	
		No.	%	No.	%
1.	Metalled	11	36.67	9	30.00
2.	Semi Metalled	-	-	-	-
3.	Un-metalled	3	10.00	16	53.33
4.	Metalled-cum-unmetalled	16	53.33	5	16.67
	All type	30	100.00	30	100.00

Table 32

MAIN MEANS OF OUT-BOUND TRANSPORT FROM SAMPLE
VILLAGES

S.No.	Means of transport	No	% No.
1.	Railway only	-	-
2.	Bus only	6	20.00
3.	Rail + Bus	2	6.67
4.	Bus + non-mechanical vehicles	16	53.33
5.	Non-mechanical vehicles only	6	20.00
	All types	30	100.00

have rail plus bus service as the main means of outbound transport.

Post Office and Schools

Only 7 of the 30 sample villages have post offices. Schools exist in 14 villages. In all there are 33 schools which means that in some villages there are more than one. Out of these 33 schools 24 are primary, 4 middle, and 5 high schools (table 33).

A total of 5347 students were enrolled in the schools in 1975. The male students numbered 4806 or 84 percent of the total. Female numbered 961 or 16 percent. (Table 34)

Banking and Credit.

The sample villages have three branch offices of commercial banks, and seven cooperative societies. All the three villages bank branches exist, have population exceeding 3000. These villages are in fact in the process of transformation from rural to urban classification and are already as good as small towns. They are important centres of trade, and lie close to main roads leading to Peshawar.

Electricity

Most of the villages, 22 /or 73.3 percent have electricity connections. In the electrified ones, most of the houses are not electrified.

Medical Facility

Government dispensaries exist only in two villages. Both of these two medical units are without a qualified doctor; the compounders head these. (Table 35)

Private medical practitioners exist in nine villages. There are in all 23 of them. Only 2 are MBBS both in the same village and 20 are unqualified practitioners. There is only one Hakim.

Table 33

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS IN SAMPLE VILLAGES

S.No.	Type of institutions/ establishments/facilities	Whether or not available in villages				Total Villages
		Yes		No		
		No.	%	No	%	
1.	Post office	7	23.33	23	76.67	30
2.	Schools	14	46.67	16	53.33	30
3.	Banks	-	-	30	100.00	30
4.	Cooperative society	7	23.33	23	76.67	30
5.	Mandis for local producer	-	-	30	100.00	30
6.	Electricity	22	73.33	8	26.67	30
7.	Medical centres (public)	2	6.67	28	93.33	30
8.	Private medical practi- cion	9	30.00	21	70.00	30

Table 34

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS AND STUDENTS IN SAMPLE VILLAGES

S.No.	Type of School	Number of		Total
		Boys	Girls	
1.	Primary	16	8	24
2.	Middle	2	2	4
3.	High	4	1	5
	All types	22	11	33

Major Occupations

Agriculture is the main occupation in all but four of the 30 sample villages. In the four villages under reference the non-agricultural sector absorbs most of the work force or is as important employer as the agricultural sector. This departure from the general pattern deserves a comment.

The prominent position of non-agricultural sector in the villages under reference is attributable principally to shortage of land, and also non-suitability of the available land for agriculture. One of these villages, Pirpai, is in transition from rural to urban characteristics. Although, an important vegetable growing area its location pattern is helping it in gradual transformation into leading centre of trade and commerce.

Another village, 'Hodh Payan' lies quite close to Peshawar, just four miles. It has only 640 acres of land, and a population of 7233 (1972). Pressure on agricultural land, and its nearness to Peshawar have been instrumental in the ascendency of non-agricultural sector in this village.

'Durran', another village of this category, has a total area of 473 acres, which is almost all hilly. Wood cutting, and labouring in and outside the village are the main occupations of the people. Its population is so small, only 244 (1972), that wood cutting casual labouring, and other petty trades have conveniently absorbed the major portion of its work force.

Employment Level

Most of the people are employed. But how many of them and how fully? This aspect was not covered as the purpose of the survey was just to have a general introduction with the villages. It is,

however, indicated by the in-migrants employment level prior to migration that open unemployment would be fairly high in these villages as well. Much more serious than this is the problem of under-employment.

Cottage Industries

In 17 out of the 30 sample villages no cottage industry exists. In the other 13, there are 61 such units. The most frequently reported ones are, wheat milling, rice husking, and cotton ginning and "gur" making (table 36).

Table 35

MEDICAL CENTRES, BEDS , AND STAFF IN SAMPLE VILLAGES

S.No.	Particulars	No.
1.	Dispensaries	1
2.	Hospitals	-
3.	Beds in Dispensaries & Hospitals	-
4.	Doctors	-
5.	Anxillary medical staff	1
6.	Private practitioners	23
	-MBBS (2)	
	-Unqualified (20)	
	-Hakim (1)	

Table 36

NUMBER AND TYPE OF COTTAGE AND SMALL INDUSTRIES IN THE SAMPLE VILLAGE

S.No.	Type of Industry	No.	Percent
1.	Wheat Grinding	31	50.8
2.	Cotton ginning	13	27.8
3.	Rice Husking	2	3.3
4.	Oil extraction	3	5.0
5.	Gur making (chani)	8	13.1
6.	All type	61	100.00

Land and Crops

With the exception of two villages most of the land in other villages is irrigated. And of the irrigated land, most is irrigated by canals in 26 villages. Wells are the chief means in the other two.

Sugarcane is the major cash crop. Among cereals, wheat is the most important one.

Out Migration

Cases of out-migration have been reported from 18 of the 30 selected villages. During 1974, approximately 220 persons left these villages. The survey's objective was not to undertake elaborate estimation of out-migration but only to have a rough idea in this respect. Villager's reports on the subject indicate that considerable out-migration has already taken place, and it is increasing further. Lack of employment opportunities and low income in villages are stated to be the principal push factors.

A large number of workers from the sample villages go daily to nearby urban centres where they have regular jobs or business. Peshawar is the most important such urban centre. People from the surrounding areas come to the city daily in the morning and return after day's work. The number of such regular commuters is presently believed to be in low thousands. The important thing about this is that their number has been increasing. Speedier transport facilities have greatly contributed to this trend. People come daily to Peshawar from as long distance as 35 miles. But the majority travels from the areas lying close by 5 to 10 miles.

OUT MIGRATION FROM PESHAWAR CITY

Along with the study of in-migration to the Peshawar city, an attempt was made to determine the nature, extent, and causes of out-migration from it. The main aim was to seek an explanation for the declining growth rate of the City's population.

From the selected sample of households it was observed that in all 150 members of such holds were no more living in Peshawar and were classified as out-migrants. Out of these, 140 had previously been living in Peshawar, while the remaining 10 were born outside Peshawar to the out-migrating parents. These 10 are also being treated as out-migrants as they would have been classified as Peshawar's population if the parents had not left the city.

Of 150 persons under study 8 had left the city before 1961. The year of departure of 7 out-migrants was not reported and is believed to be before 1961. Another 10 cases are in the 'not applicable category' as they were born to out-migrants after they had left the city. This leaves 127 cases of 1961 out-migration.

(Table 37)

Reasons of Out-Migration

Table 38 indicates that the economic and non-economic reasons were almost even. Generally speaking, the pull factors were more important than the push factors. The specific reasons of out-migration are discussed as follows.

Marriage was stated to be the cause of migration in 41.34

Table 37
OUT-MIGRANTS BY YEAR OF FIRST LEAVING PESHAWAR

No. Year	Male		Female		Both Sexes	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Before 1961	2	2.90	6	7.41	8	5.33
1961	-	-	2	2.47	2	1.33
1962	-	-	3	3.70	3	2.00
1963	1	1.45	-	-	1	0.67
1964	2	2.90	4	4.94	6	4.00
1965	1	1.45	1	1.23	2	1.33
1966	-	-	2	2.47	2	1.33
1967	-	-	2	2.47	2	1.33
1968	2	2.90	6	7.41	8	5.33
1969	2	2.90	4	4.94	6	4.00
1970	-	-	10	12.35	10	6.67
1971	5	7.24	4	4.94	9	6.00
1972	18	26.09	15	18.52	33	22.00
1973	11	15.94	11	13.58	22	14.68
1974	14	20.29	7	8.64	21	14.00
Not reported	4	5.80	1	1.23	5	3.33
Not applicable	7	10.14	3	3.70	10	6.67
Total	69	100.00	81	100.00	150	100.00

Table 38
OUT-MIGRANTS BY REASON FOR GOING OUT OF
PESHAWAR

S.No. Reasons	Code No.	Male		Female		Both Sexes	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Education	02	5	7.25	-	-	5	3.33
2. Marriage	03	-	-	62	76.54	62	41.34
3. Offer of better job/business	04	32	46.38	1	1.23	33	22.00
4. Better jobs and business opportunity	05	5	7.25	-	-	5	3.33
5. Transfer	08	3	11.59	-	-	8	5.33
6. With family	23	8	11.59	12	14.82	20	13.34
7. Family dispute	26	9	13.04	6	7.41	15	10.00
8. Not reported	14	2	2.90	-	-	2	1.33
Total		69	100.00	81	100.00	150	100.00

percent cases; who were all females. Another 10 percent left the city to establish a separate household elsewhere due to family disputes between wives and husbands.

Migration in pursuit of education was reported in 3.33 percent cases. These are treated as out-migrants as the persons concerned had been out for one year or more or were expected to remain out for that period.

Economic reasons were specified in 46 or 30.66 percent, cases. These are (i) offer of better jobs or/and business deal, being mentioned in 22 percent cases, (ii) hope of getting better job or/and business opportunities, 3.33 percent cases, and (iii) transfer, accounting for 5.33 percent ou-migrants. Another 13.34 percent had moved out in family; the latter are also believed to have migrated for economic reasons.

No out-migrant was reported to have left with the intention of permanently staying out of Peshawar. However, most of them, 89.3 percent, were likely to stay out for an indefinite period. The remaining 10.7 percent were expected to return to Peshawar after one year or more.

Destination of Out-Migrants in number

Most of the out-migrants, 126 or 84 percent, had gone to various places within Pakistan. The whereabouts of one out-migrants are not reported. The remaining 2.3 or 15 percent had gone abroad (Table 39).

Table 39

OUT-MIGRANTS BY THEIR PRESENT PLACE OF RESIDENCE

S.No.	Present place of Residence	Male		Female		Both sexes	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Hazara	-	-	1	1.23	1	0.67
2.	Mardan	5	7.25	6	7.42	11	7.33
3.	Peshawar	11	15.94	22	27.17	33	22.00
4.	Kohat	-	-	2	2.48	2	1.33
5.	Bannu	-	-	1	1.23	1	0.67
6.	Rawalpindi	12	17.39	12	14.81	24	16.00
7.	Gujrat	-	-	3	3.70	3	2.00
8.	Sargodha	-	-	1	1.23	1	0.67
9.	Mianwali	-	-	3	3.70	3	2.00
10.	Jhang	1	1.45	1	1.23	2	1.33
11.	Lahore	7	10.15	8	9.88	15	10.00
12.	Sialkot	-	-	1	1.23	1	0.67
13.	Multan	-	-	2	2.48	2	1.33
14.	Karachi	11	15.94	8	9.88	19	12.67
15.	Grece	1	1.45	-	-	1	0.67
16.	Libya	2	2.90	1	1.23	3	2.00
17.	Iran	2	2.90	3	3.70	5	3.33
18.	U.S.A.	3	4.34	-	-	3	2.00
19.	U.K.	3	4.34	-	-	3	2.00
20.	Saudi Arabia	2	2.90	1	1.23	3	2.00
21.	Malakand	-	-	1	1.23	1	0.67
22.	Khyber Agency	-	-	1	1.23	1	0.67
23.	Kurram	2	2.90	-	-	2	1.33
24.	Chitral	-	-	2	2.48	2	1.33
25.	Afghanistan	2	2.90	-	-	2	1.33
26.	Holland	1	1.45	-	-	1	0.67
27.	Switzerland	1	1.45	-	-	1	0.67
28.	Muscat	2	2.90	-	-	2	1.33
29.	Not reported	1	1.45	1	1.23	2	1.33
Total		69	100.00	81	100.00	150	100.00

The destinations of 36 percent out-migrants were within province of NWFP and the adjoining tribal areas. The Punjab province received 34 percent and Sind 12.66 percent of the out-migrants from Peshawar city.

<u>Place of Present residence of Out-migrants</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
N.W.F.P. and Tribal Areas	54	36.00
Punjab	51	34.00
Sind	19	12.66
Baluchistan	-	-
Other countries	24	16.00
Not reported	2	1.34
	<u>150</u>	<u>100.00</u>

The single largest number of out-migrants 33 or 22 percent went to different places in the Peshawar district. The Rawalpindi district received 24 or 16 percent, Karachi and Lahore followed with 19 (or 12.67 percent) and 15 (or 10.00 percent) respectively. Mardan claimed 11 or 7.33 percent. In all other district their number was between one and three.

Characteristics of Out-Migrants

Most of the out-migrants, 84.66 percent were born in the Peshawar city. Including the other places in Peshawar District, the latter's share rises to 89.98 percent (Table 40).

Persons born in other parts of NWFP but resident in Peshawar at the time of out-migration constituted 6.67 percent of out-migrants to Peshawar

Table 40
OUT-MIGRANTS BY PLACE OF BIRTH

S.No.	Place	Male		Female		Both sexes	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Mardan District	2	2.90	1	1.23	3	2.00
2.	Peshawar Distt. excluding Peshawar city	4	5.80	4	4.94	8	5.32
3.	Peshawar city	56	81.16	71	87.66	127	84.66
4.	Lahore District	-	-	1	1.23	1	0.67
5.	Libya	1	1.45	-	-	1	0.67
6.	Iran	1	1.45	-	-	1	0.67
7.	Saudi Arabia	1	1.45	-	-	1	0.67
8.	Mohand Agency	1	1.45	2	2.48	3	2.00
9.	Khyber "	-	-	1	1.23	1	0.67
10.	Swat	1	1.45	-	-	1	0.67
11.	Dir	2	2.89	-	-	2	1.33
12.	India	-	-	1	1.23	1	0.67
Total		69	100.00	81	100.00	150	100.00

Age Distribution

All age group upto 60-64 are represented. The concentration is relatively larger in the younger brackets 15-40, as will be seen from the following summary statistics based on table given below:-

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Upto 14	20.00
15-19	11.33
20-30	36.00
31-40	26.00
41-	6.67
	<u>100.00</u>

A comparative study of these data and corresponding age distribution of in-migrants would reveal heavier representation of younger ages in the out-migrating than in the in-migrating population (Table 41). In the latter, as we saw in an earlier chapter, the rural population is heavily represented. This suggest that the older people with heavy rural representation are easier to attract out or distract from their permanent abodes than the corresponding age groups of urban origin. Or put alternatively, the older age groups of urban areas would need far stronger incentives than their rural counterparts to leave for the other places.

Marital Status

Of the males 33 percent and of the females 36 percent were married. The corresponding figure for both sexes comes to 62 percent (table 42).

Table 41

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF OUT-MIGRANTS

12-13 Age Group	Number			Percent		
	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes
Below 5	7	2	9	10.14	2.47	6.00
5-9	6	4	10	8.70	4.94	6.67
10-14	6	5	11	8.70	6.17	7.33
15-19	6	11	17	8.70	13.58	11.33
20-24	5	19	24	7.25	23.46	16.00
25-29	11	19	30	15.94	23.46	20.00
30-34	13	13	26	18.84	16.05	17.33
35-39	7	6	13	10.14	7.41	8.67
40-44	2	1	3	2.90	1.23	2.00
45-49	3	-	3	4.34	-	2.00
50-54	1	1	2	1.45	1.23	1.33
55-59	1	-	1	1.45	-	0.67
60-64	1	-	1	1.45	-	0.67
Total	69	81	150	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 42

MARITAL STATUS OF OUT-MIGRANTS BY AGE

12-13 Age Group	Married				Unmarried			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 12	-	-	-	-	13	39.13	8	70.00
13	-	-	1	1.43	-	-	1	10.00
14	-	-	2	2.86	1	2.17	-	-
15	-	-	1	1.43	2	4.35	-	-
16	-	-	3	4.28	-	-	-	-
17- 20	-	-	13	18.57	4	8.70	-	-
21- 25	2	8.70	21	30.00	7	15.22	1	10.00
26- 30	7	30.43	19	27.14	10	21.74	-	-
31- 35	5	21.74	7	10.00	2	4.35	1	10.00
36- 40	4	17.39	2	2.86	1	2.17	-	-
41- 45	2	8.70	-	-	1	2.17	-	-
46- 50	-	-	1	1.43	-	-	-	-
51- 55	2	8.70	-	-	-	-	-	-
56- 60	1	4.34	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	23	100.00	70	100.00	46	100.00	11	100.00

None of the males of under 20 years was reported as married. On the other hand as many as 20 of the 70 married females were aged 20/^{years}or less; one of these was only 13 years.

Literacy and Education

The literates slightly out-numbered the illiterates in the sample. They constituted 51 percent of the out-migrants. The remaining 49 percent were illiterates. (Table 43) Among the males, 69 percent, and among the females, about 37 percent were literate.

Taking both sexes together, 29.16 percent out-migrants had passed Intermediate and higher examinations. The corresponding figures for males and females considered separately are 37.52 percent and 13.79 percent respectively (Table 44).

The males were better educated than the females. On them, 25.57 percent had passed first degree and higher examinations. On the other hand the corresponding figure for females is only 3.45 percent.

Working Status

The proportion of the economically active and also the employed workers increased after migration. The rise in the working population came about chiefly due to entry to the labour market by those who were previously students.

Before migration, 23.03 percent of the out-migrants aged 10 and over were either working or available for work. In the case of males 55.93 percent and in that of females only 2.74 percent were in the civilian labour force (Table 45).

After migration the activity rate rose to 35.77 percent, for both sexes, for the males it was 73.33 percent and in case of females it declined to 2.60 percent.

Table 43

LITERACY STATUS OF OUT-MIGRANTS
(5 years and over)

S.No. Literacy Status	Male		Female		Bothe sexes	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1. Literate	43	69.00	29	36.71	72	51.06
2. Illiterate	19	31.00	50	63.29	69	48.94
3. Total	62	100.00	79	100.00	141	100.00

Table 44

LITERATE OUTMIGRANTS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

S.No. Highest Grade Passed	Male		Female		Both sexes	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1. Grade 01	4	9.30	1	3.45	5	6.94
2. " 02	1	2.33	2	6.89	3	4.17
3. " 03	-	-	1	3.45	1	1.39
4. " 04	1	2.33	1	3.45	2	2.78
5. " 05	3	6.93	3	10.34	6	8.33
6. " 06	1	2.33	-	-	1	1.39
7. " 07	1	2.33	-	-	1	1.39
8. " 08	5	11.63	3	10.34	8	11.11
9. " 09	2	4.65	1	3.45	3	4.17
10. " 10	8	18.60	13	44.84	21	29.17
11. Intermediate.	6	13.95	3	10.34	9	12.50
12. B.A./B.Sc.	4	9.30	1	3.45	5	6.94
13. M.A/M.Sc	5	11.63	-	-	5	6.94
14. B.Sc/Eng.MBBS/Law	2	4.64	-	-	2	2.78
Total	43	100.00	29	100.00	72	100.00

All but two of the 35 males in the civilian labour force were employed before migration. After migration the unemployment rate fell to zero.

In case of female civilian labour force, none was unemployed before or after migration.

In respect of occupation before and after out-migration, the type of change as observed in the case of in-migrants is not seen in it. This indicates that as compared with the in-migrants, a larger proportion of the people under study was able to find jobs related to their previous experience (Table 46).

Before migration, 'sales workers' constituted the single largest group with 25.72 percent, followed closely by production group with 22.36 percent. This latter category became the leading one after migration, claiming 24.49 percent of the labour force. Sales workers slipped to the second position with 16.33 percent.

Income

Pre-migration income data were available in 23 cases and post-migration data in 36 cases. Before migration, 67.85 percent of the persons concerned earned three hundred rupees or less. On the other hand the corresponding figure for post-migration period is 44.45 percent (Table 47).

It is significant that before migration there was no case of income exceeding one thousand rupees a month. In the post-migration period 3 such cases are found; these account for 22 percent of the out-migrants concerned.

Table 45

WORKING STATUS OF OUT-MIGRANTS (10 years +)

S.No. Working Status	Before Out-Migration						After Out-Migration					
	Male		Female		Both sexes		Male		Female		Both sexes	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Employed	33	55.93	2	2.74	35	26.52	47	78.32	2	2.60	49	35.77
Not working; looking for work	2	3.39	-	-	2	1.51	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not available for work	24	40.68	71	97.26	95	71.97	13	21.67	75	97.40	88	64.23
i. Household duty	-	-	63	86.30	63	47.73	-	-	71	92.21	71	51.82
ii. Students.	24	40.58	8	10.96	32	24.24	13	21.67	4	5.19	17	12.41
	59	100	73	100	132	100	60	100	77	100	137	100

Table 46

OCCUPATIONS OF OUT-MIGRANTS

S.No. Occupational Group	Previous		After	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. Production, Technical and Related worker	4	11.43	4	8.16
2. Administration and Mechanical workers	2	5.71	6	12.25
3. Clerical and Related workers.	3	8.57	5	10.20
4. Sales workers	9	25.72	8	16.33
5. Service workers	2	5.71	2	4.08
6. Production and Related workers	8	22.86	12	24.49
7. Unclassified	3	8.57	7	14.29
8. Armed forces	4	11.43	5	10.20
9. All Occupations	35	100.00	49	100.00

Table 47
OUT-MIGRANTS BY INCOME

S.No. Monthly Income	Before Migration		After Migration	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. Less than Rs. 50	1	3.57	-	-
2. 51- 100	4	14.28	-	-
3. 101-200	3	23.57	2	5.56
4. 201-300	6	21.43	14	28.89
5. 302-400	3	10.72	4	11.11
6. 401-500	1	3.57	4	11.11
7. 501-750	3	10.72	3	8.33
8. 751-1000	2	7.14	1	2.78
9. 1001-2000	-	-	1	2.78
10. 2001-3000	-	-	2	5.56
11. 3001 and above	-	-	5	13.83
	28	100.00	36	100.00

MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

In pursuing the ultimate objective of finding out the factors influencing urbanization in Pakistan, the present study provides results of a sample survey of the city of Peshawar in the N.W.F.P. province of Pakistan. The data collected through the survey indicate that most of the in-migrants to Peshawar city have come within the N.W.F.P. and the adjoining tribal areas. The previous abodes of 76.24 percent in-migrant household heads came within NWFP., and 8.16 percent in Tribal areas. The Punjab province contributed 8.51 percent and the Sind and Baluchistan provinces 0.72 and 1.06 percent respectively. The rest came from outside Pakistan.

The rural areas accounted for 66.46 percent of the in-migrants. Of those originating from within NWFP and tribal areas 70.93 percent were from rural areas.

Among the different districts taken separately, Peshawar district itself is the single most important source, claiming 40.54 percent in-migrants household heads. Mardan and Kohat are the other important ones with 19.64 percent and 6.64 percent respectively. The Mahmand Agency contributed 5.67 percent.

Among the characteristics that prominently distinguish the in-migrants from the Province's population in general is their literacy rate. The survey revealed that 39.7 percent in-migrant household heads were literate. Of the total literates 76.7 percent had attained Matriculation and higher levels of education. The corresponding estimate for all in-migrating population aged 5 years and above are 31.3 percent and 46 percent respectively.

These findings strongly suggest that with the spread of higher education among the rural folk, mobility from rural to urban areas is likely to increase further. The main explanation lies in the lack or the absence of suitable jobs for the educated manpower in the rural areas. Even otherwise the educated people seem to prefer the urban life to the rural. This is suggested also by respondent's statements of reasons for leaving their previous abodes.

On the basis of the present study no objective conclusion can be reached about ^{the} association between caste and mobility of the people. However, the study hints at the possible influences of caste on the occupations of the people and thereby on their mobility, if the occupations concerned offer better employment prospects in the cities.

There are however, strong suggestions about the fact that to the occupations which are monopolised by a given caste group in the city, the new entrants to that occupation from outside are mostly from the same caste groups. For instance, tea shops, firewood stalls, casual labour and petty vending are monopolised by 'Mahmand'. This facilitates the entry of people from Mahmand tribe to the city, as they get preferential treatment in the matter of employment. Thus, while nothing conclusive can be said about the impact of social castes on mobility, the survey's findings do suggest that certain occupational groups are more mobile than others.

Noticeable improvement took place in the in-migrant's income and employment level due to migration. Also their occupational composition underwent a significant change.

Previously 12.06 percent of the in-migrating household heads were unemployed. The unemployment rate fell to 1.03 percent after migration.

Before migration 11.24 percent respondents under reference earned less than fifty rupees a month. After it, only 0.77 percent belonged to this category.

Agriculture was the single largest employer before migration. Production, sales and service groups emerged as the principal ones after migration, accounting for 31.82 percent, 25.00 percent, and 10.23 percent of the workers respectively. The shift is quite consistent with the skill composition of the in-migrants.

The reasons for which the respondents left their previous places of residence can be sifted into (i) economic, (ii) non-economic and (iii) a combination of the aforesaid two. Economic reasons were specified by 68.44 percent^{of the} respondents, non-economic by 7.44 percent, and the combination of these two by 24.12 percent.

The push factors appear to be more dominant than the pull factors. That is, they were forced, not attracted out of their previous abodes. Thus 33.68 percent stated that they left because income was insufficient. Another 5.32 percent left because of lack of employment opportunities in the villages after education, 2.32 percent due to insufficiency of land, and 5.32 percent for lack of non-agricultural jobs.

The rural areas of Peshawar district were briefly surveyed as a part of an attempt to discern the factors of migration. The findings of the survey reinforce the existence^{of} push factors indicated by the in-migrants. The people in rural areas are heavily

dependent on agriculture. Only 61 units in cottage and small scale industry were enumerated in the 30 sample villages. Land is limited and the population is growing fast.

Some briskness has been observed in trade activity. Rising prices of sugar cane, wheat, fruit, and vegetables have brought some relief to growers. Commercialisation of agricultural activity is on the increase. But despite all this, the villages are losing people in large number, as their manpower absorption capacity is limited while the supply of manpower is increasing fast. The pressure of the out-bound population is partly on the nearby urban centres; Peshawar, Nowshera, Mardan, Charsadda etc. in NWFP; but mainly on those in Punjab and Sind.

Most of the out-migrants left for places within the country. Those going abroad accounted for 15 percent of the total migrants.

The primary reasons for out-migration included Marriage, family problems and transfer of service or search for job.

None of the out-migrant was reported to have left the city with the intention of staying out for ever. The period of stay out of Peshawar was expected to be one year or more in 10.7 percent cases. While the others were likely to stay out for an indefinite period.

Unlike the in-migrants to Peshawar, most of the out-migrants went into occupations which were related to their previous experience. They also enjoyed a better level of income and employment in their new places of work as compared with the in-migrants.

APPENDICES

LIST OF SAMPLE VILLAGES

S.No.	Household No.	Name of village & local details	Tehsil	Area in Acres	Population	
					1961	1972
1.	39	Sahara Sang	Peshawar	313	285	176
2.	47	Pir Bala	"	417	600	776
3.	71	Takhtabad Awal	"	1295	1477	2213
4.	74	Naghmi	"	610	515	612
5.	86	Bhattian	"	253	550	891
6.	11	Mandova	"	296	321	535
7.	92	Gehi	"	402	468	756
8.	168	Jhalarian	"	382	256	393
9.	123	Bela Nikokhan	"	548	351	502
10.	129	Nasir Pur	"	187	1238	1488
11.	222	Palosi Piran	"	70	264	429
12.	207	Nodha Payan	"	640	3298	7233
13.	245	Badh Bar Moryazi	"	3438	4596	7789
14.	266	Khali Zai	"	2441	1893	3096
15.	244	Bad Ber Harzai	"	5317	3162	4882
16.	64	Sareehlealer	Charsadda	537	226	1834
17.	67	Manduri	"	188	108	1071
18.	71	Hissar	"	1770	571	1872
19.	186	Malha Dher	"	1005	1358	2278
20.	113	Maha Allozai	"	4388	1199	1957
21.	102	Dang Qila	"	43	250	336
22.	144	Hawaral	"	2458	3061	4810
23.	10	Banda Nabauk	Newsheera	1756	2469	3607

contd. next page.

24.	21	Chalri Mamroiz	Nowshere	1234	1676	2222
25.	33	Jalla Khadsa	"	743	1098	1655
26.	38	Garhi Faizullah	"	2781	145	1400
27.	52	Pirpai	"	6291	5432	8299
28.	71	Pir Sabeq	"	5598	5775	8375
29.	102	Durrani	"	473	160	244
30.	164	Kawa	"	328	44	63

APPENDIX-II

QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE PESHAWAR SURVEY

Part-I

1. Enumerator's questionnaire's continuous serial number.
2. Enumerator's code number
3. Enumerators name.
4. Property and block number
5. Address
6. Number on the survey list
7. Sector No.
8. Sample number
9. Number of households in this property unit
10. Interviewed household's number
11. Since when are you living in Peshawar city?

- i) After 1st August, 1974-----
- ii) 1.8.73-31.7.1974-----
- iii) Before 31.7.1973-----
 - a. After 1961-----
 - b. Before 1961 census-----

Note:-

Questions number 12 to 15 are applicable only to those who migrated to Peshawar after the 1961 census.

12. State the structure of the house in which you lived before migration.
 - i) Pucca----- (ii) Sami pucca -----
 - iii) Jhugged/Chappor----- (iv) Other type (specify)-----
13. Tenure status of the previous home:-
 - i) Owned _____ (ii) Rented in _____
 - iii) Neither owned nor rented in.

14. Structure of the present house:-
 - i) Pucca-----(ii) Semi pucca-----
 - iii) Katcha----- (iv) Chuggi/Chapper-----
15. Tenure status of the present house:-
 - i) Owned -----(ii) Rented in-----
 - iii) Neither owned nor rented in-----
16. Name of household head.
17. Respondent's relationship with the household head.
18. Respondent's age.
19. Respondent's sex.

Part-II

-76-

(The following information was obtained from household members)

1. Relation with household head
2. Sex
3. Age (completed years)
4. Marital status
5. Caste
6. Religion
7. Education.
8. Place of birth
9. Occupation after moving into Peshawar
10. Occupation before moving into Peshawar
11. Monthly income after coming to Peshawar
12. Monthly income before coming to Peshawar
13. Money received from home
14. Money sent home
15. Place of previous residence
-Village/City
District
Province
16. When did you come to Peshawar ?
17. Why did you leave the previous place of residence ?
18. Why did you come to Peshawar ?
19. Why did you especially select Peshawar?
20. How long do you intened to stay in Peshawar ?
21. Were you informed by any one about the opportunities in Peshawar? If yes, by whom.

Part-III

SCHEDULE FOR OUT-MIGRANTS

The following information was obtained about the
Out-Migrant

1. Sex
2. Age
3. Marital Status
4. Caste
5. Religion
6. Relationship with the household head/who answer part I & II.
7. Education
8. Place of birth
9. Occupation before and after leaving Peshawar
10. Monthly income before and after leaving Peshawar.
11. When did he first come to Peshawar
12. Reason for first leaving Peshawar
13. Reason for leaving Peshawar
14. Period elapsed since he left Peshawar.
15. Expected period of stay out of Peshawar
16. Present residence .
17. Reason for last leaving Peshawar.

INFRASTRUCTURE OF THE SAMPLE VILLAGES
IN PESHAWAR DISTRICT

1. (a) Name of village.....(b) Tehsil.....
(c) Distance from Peshawar city.....

2. Population

Year	Male	Female	Both Sexes
1961			
1972			

3. (a) Name of nearest city/town (other than Peshawar).....
(b) Distance of 3 (a) from the village.....

4. How is the village connected with Peshawar
- | |
|----------------------|
| <u>By rail</u> |
| <u>By Pucca Road</u> |
| <u>Kutchra</u> |

5. (a) Name of the nearest Railway station:-

- (b) Distance of the Railway station from the village

- (c) Is the approach road from the village to the
Railway station.....
- | |
|----------------------|
| <u>Metalled</u> |
| <u>Semi-metalled</u> |
| <u>Kutchra</u> |

- (d) Is the approach road from the village
to the main road leading to Peshawar.....
- | |
|----------------------|
| <u>Metalled</u> |
| <u>Semi-metalled</u> |
| <u>Kutchra</u> |

6. Means of out-bound transportation.
- | |
|---------------------|
| <u>Rail</u> |
| <u>Bus</u> |
| <u>Tonga</u> |
| <u>Bullock cart</u> |

7. Post office.....yes/No

8. School(s).....Yes/No
If "yes" state

School's level	Number of schools			Number of students		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
Primary						
Middle						
High						

9. Banks.....Yes/No

	BANK	NUMBER
1.	Cooperative	
2.	Commercial	

10. Cooperative societies.....Yes/No
If yes state

S.No.	Type of societies	Number

11. (a) Marketing facility for agricultural products:

Market (Mandi) exists
No such facility

(b) In case no mandi exists the distance of nearest Mandi _____ (miles)

12. (a) Is the village electrified.....Yes/No
(b) If "Yes" are most of the houses electrified? Yes/No

13. (a) Medical facilities.....Exist/do not exist

Medical Units	No. of beds	No of doctors	No of other medical staff
---------------	-------------	---------------	---------------------------

Govt. Hospital

Govt. Dispensary

(b) Number of private medical practitioners

	Types	Number
1.	Doctors (MBBS)	
2.	Unqualified Doctors	
3.	Hakims	

14. Source of drinking water:

15. Predominant occupation of population:-

Mostly agriculturists
Mostly Non-agriculturists

- 16. Size of Agricultural holding in general _____ (accts)
- 17. Employment status of population in general _____

Category	Employment Status		About the Employed	
	Mostly Employed	Mostly un-employed	Mostly self employed	Mostly employed by others
Agriculturists				
Non-Agriculturists				

18. Cottage industries

	<u>Name of Industry</u>	<u>Number of Units</u>
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

19. Any small scale industry.....Yes/No
If yes state

	<u>Name/type</u>	<u>No. of units</u>
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

20. Number of shops:-

	<u>Type</u>	<u>No.</u>
--	-------------	------------

21. Main crops of the village:-

	<u>Name of crop</u>	<u>Area</u>
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

22. Agricultural land by means of irrigation:-

- (a) i) Most of the land irrigated
- ii) Most of the land un-irrigated
- (b) Of the irrigated land:-
 - Mostly canal irrigated
 - Mostly well-irrigated
 - Mostly under canal-cum-well irrigation
- (c) Number of tubewells in the village:-

23. (a) The known number of persons from this village who migrated to cities during 1974:-

(b) Destination of out-migrants (list in the order of importance).

24. Type of houses:-

Mostly:- Pucca
Semi-Pucca
Katcha

Table I

OCCUPATIONS OF IN-MIGRANTS HOUSEHOLD HEADS

S.No.	Occupational Group	Present			Previous		
		Male	Female	Both	Male	Female	Both
		sexes					
		No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
I	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
I	Major Group:0/1:-						
	<u>Professional, Technical and Related Workers</u>	19	-	19	5	-	5
	1. Physical scientists and Related Technician	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2. Architects, Engineers, and related technicians	1	-	1	-	-	-
	3. Medical, Dental, Veterinary and related workers.	5	-	5	3	-	3
	4. Accountants	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5. Jurists	2	-	2	1	-	1
	6. Teachers	3	-	3	-	-	-
	7. Workers in Religion	6	-	6	1	-	1
	8. Authors, Journalists and Related writers	2	-	2	-	-	-
II	Major Group 2:- <u>Administrative And Related Workers</u>	11	-	11	9	-	9
	1. Legislative officials, administrative and executive officials, Govt.	7	-	7	6	-	6
	2. Directors, Managers, and working proprietors (Manufacturing, construction, Electricity	1	-	1	-	-	-
	3. Administrators and Managers (bank and other financial institutions.	2	-	2	2	-	2
	4. Administrations:- Transport, communication etc.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5. Directory, Managers and working proprietors (service industries excluding managers and working proprietors catering and lodging including administrator (community and business services); administration (recreation services); administration (personal service)	1	-	1	1	-	1

Contd.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
III. Major Group 3:-							
<u>Clerical and Related Workers</u>		34	-	34	21	-	21
1.	Clerical supervisors	2	-	2	1	-	1
2.	Govt. Executive officials (Non Gazetted)	7	-	7	7	-	7
3.	Stenographers, typist and card and tape punching machine operators	6	-	-	-	-	-
4.	Book-keepers, cashiers, and related workers.	1	-	1	-	-	-
5.	Transport and communication supervisors	2	-	2	-	-	-
6.	Transport conductors	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.	Mail distribution clerks and workers	-	-	-	-	-	-
8.	Tele-communication operators	2	-	2	2	-	2
9.	Clerical and related workers not elsewhere classified	20	-	20	11	-	11
IV. Major Group 4:-							
<u>Sales Workers</u>		66	-	66	31	-	31
1.	<u>Working proprietors:-</u> whole- sale traders/dealers, pro- prietors other than retent traders.	-	-	-	28	-	28
2.	<u>Working Proprietors:-</u> Retail Trade	58	-	58	-	-	-
3.	Sales supervisors and buyers	1	-	1	-	-	-
4.	Technical salesman, commercial travellers and manufacturing agents.	-	-	-	-	-	-
5.	Insurance, Real estate, securities and business service salesman and Auctioneers.	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.	Salesman, shop Assistant and related workers	7	-	7	3	-	3
7.	Sales workers not elsewhere classified	-	-	-	-	-	-
V. Major Group 5:-							
<u>Service Workers</u>		27	-	27	4	-	4
1.	Managers	1	-	1	-	-	-
2.	Working proprietors (catering blodying) services	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.	Cook, waiters	5	-	5	-	-	-
4.	Maids and related housekeeping service workers not elsewhere classified	2	-	2	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5. Building caretakers, char workers, cleaners and related workers.		-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Launderers, Dry cleaners and pressers		2	-	2	-	-	-
7. Hairdressers, barbers, beauticians, and related workers		2	-	2	-	-	-
8. Protection service workers		13	-	13	2	-	2
9. Service workers not elsewhere classified		2	-	2	-	-	-
VI. Major Group 6:-							
<u>Agriculture Animal Husbandry And Forestry Workers, Fishermen and Hunters</u>							
1. Non-working and owners		-	-	-	2	-	2
2. Cultivators including those tilling the land personally or personally supervising its tilling		7	-	7	69	-	69
3. Agriculture and Husbandry workers		-	-	-	-	-	-
VII Major Group 7:- Production and Related Workers, Transport, Equipment operators and Labours							
<u>Labours</u>							
1. Production supervisors and general foreman		1	-	1	-	-	-
2. Metal Processors and Manufacturers.		-	-	-	1	-	1
3. Wood preparation workers and paper makers		-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Spinners, weavers, knitters, dayers and related workers		5	-	5	5	-	5
5. Food and beverage processors		2	-	2	-	-	-
6. Tailors, dress-makers, sewers, upholsterers and related workers.		9	-	9	4	-	4
7. Shoe makers and leather goods makers		4	-	4	1	-	1
8. Sports goods makers		-	-	-	1	-	1
9. Blacksmith, Toolmakers and machine tool operators		3	-	3	-	-	-
10. Machinery fitters, machine Assemblers and precision Instrument makers		2	-	2	-	-	-
11. Electrical fitters and related electrical and electronic workers.		2	-	2	-	-	-
12. Broad carting station and sound equipment operators		-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Plumbers, welders, sheet metal and structural metal preparers and erector		-	-	-	-	-	-

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
14. Jewellery and precious metal workers.	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
15. Glass borganers, polters and related workers.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16. Rubber and plastic product makers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. Printers and related workers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18. Musical instrument makers	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
19. Bricklayers, carpenters and other construction workers	6	-	6	6	6	-	-	6
20. Transport equipment operator	14	-	14	7	-	-	-	7
21. Labourers not elsewhere classified	34	-	34	27	-	-	-	27
VIII Major Group 8:- <u>Workers Not Classified by occupation</u>	8	-	8	7	-	-	-	7
IX. <u>Armed Forces Employees</u>	8	-	8	15	-	-	-	15
X. <u>Persons not Gainfully employed nor looking for work</u>	12	3	15	29	3	-	-	32
1. House-wife (including girls aged 10 & above not going to school)	-	3	3	-	3	-	-	3
2. Persons aged 60 and over	4	-	4	1	-	-	-	1
3. Children less than 10 years of age-not going to schools	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Students	3	-	3	27	-	-	-	27
5. Pensioners	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	-
6. Invalids	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
. <u>Unemployed</u>	3	-	3	34	-	-	-	34
Total	279	3	282	279	3	-	-	282

Table 2
OCCUPATIONS OF ALL IN-MIGRANTS

S.No.	Occupation Group	Present			Previous		
		Male No.	Female No.	Both No.	Male No.	Female No.	Both No.
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
I. Major Group 1:- Professional, Technical and Related Workers							
		<u>23</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>6</u>
1.	Physical Scientists and related technicians	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.	Architects, engineers, and related technician	1	-	1	-	-	-
3.	Medical, dental, veterinary and related workers.	3	-	3	4	-	4
4.	Accountants	-	-	-	-	-	-
5.	Tourists	3	-	3	1	-	1
6.	Teachers	3	3	6	-	-	-
7.	Worker in Religion	6	-	6	1	-	1
8.	Authors, journalists and related visitors.	2	-	2	-	-	-
II. Major Group 2:- Administration and related workers							
		<u>13</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>3</u>
1.	Legislation officers, administrative and executive officials, Govt.	7	-	7	1	-	1
2.	Directors, Managers, and working, prop.	1	-	1	-	-	-
3.	Administrator and Managers (bank and other financial institution).	3	-	3	1	-	1
4.	Administration, Transport, communications etc.	-	-	-	-	-	-
5.	Directors, Managers, and working proprietors (service industries excluding managers and working proprietors. Including administration (community and business services). Administration personal services).	2	-	2	1	-	1
III. Major Group 3:- Clerical and related Workers							
		<u>42</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>23</u>
1.	Clerical supervision	3	-	3	2	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2. Govt. Executive officers (non gazetted)		8	-	8	7	-	7
3. Stenographers, typists and top punching machine operators		1	-	1	-	-	-
4. Book-keepers, carbins and related workers		2	-	2	-	-	-
5. Transport and communicative supervisors		2	-	2	-	-	-
6. Transport conductors		1	-	1	-	-	-
7. Mail distribution clerks and workers.		-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Tele-communication operators		2	-	2	2	-	2
9. Clerical and related workers, not, elsewhere classified.		23	-	23	12	-	12
IV. Major Group 4:-							
<u>Sales Workers</u>		<u>113</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>42</u>
1. Working proprietors:- wholesale trading dealers, proprietors other than petant traders.		1	-	1	1	-	1
2. Working proprietors:- retail traders		101	-	101	37	1	38
3. Sale supervisors and surveys		1	-	1	-	-	-
4. Technical salesman, commercial travellers and manufacturing agents.		-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Insurance, Real estate, securities and business service salesman and Auctioners.		-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Salesmand, shop assistants and related workers.		10	-	10	4	-	4
7. Sales workers not elsewhere classified		-	-	-	-	-	-
V. Major Group:- 5.							
<u>Service workers</u>		<u>33</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>
1. Managers		1	-	1	-	-	-
2. Working proprietors(catering and lodging services)		-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Cooks, Waiters		6	-	6	-	-	-
4. Meniels and related house keeping services workers not elsewhere classified.		4	2	6	-	2	2
5. Building caretakers, chan workers, cleaners and related workers		-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Landerors, dry cleaners and pressers		2	-	2	-	-	-
7. Hairdressers, Barbar buticians, and related workers.		2	-	2	2	-	2

1	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
8.	Protection service workers	16	-	16	2	-	2
9.	Service workers not elsewhere classified.	2	-	2	-	-	-
VI	<u>Major Group 6:- Agriculturist.</u>						
	<u>Animal Husbandry and</u>						
	<u>Forestry workers.</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<u>Fisherman and Hunters</u>	8	-	8	97	2	99
1.	Non-working land owners	-	-	-	2	-	2
2.	Cultivators including those tilling the land personally or personally supervision its tilling	8	-	8	95	2	97
3.	Agriculture and Husbandry workers	-	-	-	-	-	-
VII.	<u>Major Group 7:- Production and related workers, transport equipment operator and</u>						
	<u>Labour</u>	139	1	140	71	2	73
1.	Production supervisors and general foreman.	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.	Metal processors and manufacturers	1	1	2	1	-	1
3.	Wood preparation workers and paper makers	1	-	1	-	-	-
4.	Spinners, weavers, knitters, dyer and related workers.	14	-	14	5	-	5
5.	Food and beverage processors.	2	-	2	-	-	-
6.	Jailors, dress arakers, sewer, whlshter and related workers.	12	-	12	3	-	3
7.	Shoe makers and leather goods makers	7	-	7	2	-	2
8.	Sports goods makers	-	-	-	1	-	1
9.	Blacksmith, tool makers and machine tools operators	-	-	-	-	-	-
10.	Machinery Fitters, Machine assemblers and precious instruments makers.	4	-	4	-	-	-
11.	Electrical fitters and related electrical and elcetric workers	-	-	-	-	-	-
12.	Broad costing station and Sound equipment operators	-	-	-	-	-	-
13.	Plumbers, welders, sheet Metal and strucheral Metal preparers and creators	-	-	-	-	-	-
14.	Jewellery and precious metal workers	-	-	-	-	-	-
15.	Glass, Poincer, Potters and related workers	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
16. Rubber and plastic product makers		-	-	-	-	-	-
17. Printers and related workers		-	-	-	1	-	1
18. Musical Instrument makers		1	-	1	1	-	1
19. Brick layers, carpenters and other construction workers		11	-	11	10	-	10
20. Transport Equipment operators		23	-	23	10	-	10
21. Labourers not elsewhere classified		61	3	64	37	2	39
VIII. Major Group VIII							
<u>Worker not classified by Occupation.</u>							
		9	-	9	9	-	9
IX. Armed Forces Employees		11	-	11	17	-	17
X. Not joinfully employed not looking for work.		243	580	823	245	452	697
1. House wife (including) girls aged 10 & above not-going to schools							
		-	375	375	-	332	332
2. Persons aged 60 and over							
		6	5	11	2	3	5
3. Children less than 10 years age-not going to schools							
		119	164	283	98	93	191
4. Students							
		92	35	127	86	24	110
5. Pensioners							
		4	-	4	-	-	-
6. Invalids							
		1	1	2	1	-	1
Unemployed:-							
		21	-	21	58	-	58
Total		639	588	-	528	459	987

Table 3

OCCUPATION OF OUT-MIGRANTS

S.No. Occupation	Before			After		
	Male	Female	Both	Male	Female	Both sexes
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
1. Civil Engineer	-	-	-	1	-	1
2. Technicians	1	-	1	-	-	-
3. Doctor	-	-	-	1	-	1
4. Nurse	-	1	1	-	1	1
5. Lawyer	1	-	1	-	-	-
6. Teacher	-	1	1	-	1	1
7. Govt. Ex-servant	-	-	-	1	-	1
8. Bankers/Manager	-	-	-	3	-	3
9. Bank Officer	2	-	2	2	-	2
10. Book-keepers etc.	1	-	1	1	-	1
11. General Clerk	-	-	-	1	-	1
12. Clerks	2	-	2	3	-	3
13. Foodstuff holders	5	-	5	4	-	4
14. General Merchants	3	-	3	3	-	3
15. Retailer etc	1	-	1	1	-	1
16. Hair dressers etc	1	-	1	1	-	1
17. Policeman	1	-	1	1	-	1
18. Production Empairs	1	-	1	1	-	1
19. Food and veverage processes	-	-	-	1	-	1
20. Machine tool operators	-	-	-	2	-	2
21. Electrical fitter	2	-	2	1	-	1
22. Carpenters	1	-	1	1	-	1
23. Construction worker	1	-	1	1	-	1
24. Drivers (Motor)	-	-	-	1	-	1
25. Manual labours	-	-	-	1	-	1
26. Other labours	3	-	3	4	-	4
27. Occupation not identifiable	3	-	3	7	-	7
28. Non-com-Army ft.	4	-	4	3	-	3
29. Common-officers	-	-	-	2	-	2
30. Housewife	-	63	63	-	71	71
31. Children below 10	10	8	18	9	4	13
32. Students	24	8	32	13	4	17
33. Unemployed	2	-	2	-	-	-
Total	69	81	150	69	81	150

INCOME OF OUT-MIGRANTS

S.No. Income	Before Out-Migra- tion.			After Out-Migra- tion		
	Male	Female	Both	Male	Female	Both
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
1. Less than Rs. 50	1	-	1	-	-	-
2. 50-100	4	-	4	-	-	-
3. 101-150	6	1	7	1	-	1
4. 151-200	-	1	1	1	-	1
5. 201-250	1	-	1	3	1	4
6. 251-300	5	-	5	9	1	10
7. 301-350	-	-	-	1	-	1
8. 351-400	3	-	3	3	-	3
9. 401-450	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. 451-500	1	-	1	4	-	4
11. 501-550	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. 551-600	1	-	1	1	-	1
13. 601-650	1	-	1	-	-	-
14. 651-700	1	-	1	2	-	2
15. 701-750	-	-	-	-	-	-
16. 751-800	-	-	-	1	-	1
17. 801-850	-	-	-	-	-	-
18. 851-900	1	-	1	-	-	-
19. 901-950	-	-	-	-	-	-
20. 950-1000	1	-	1	-	-	-
21. 1001-1100	-	-	-	-	-	-
22. 1100-1200	-	-	-	2	-	2
23. 1201-1900	-	-	-	-	-	-
24. 1901-2000	-	-	-	-	-	1
25. 2001-3000	-	-	-	2	-	2
26. 3001 and above	-	-	-	5	-	5
27. Alongwith some other	1	-	1	1	-	1
28. Not given	6	-	6	10	-	10
29. Not applicable	36	79	115	22	79	101
Total	69	81	150	69	81	150

PLACE OF PREVIOUS RESIDENCE OF IN-MIGRANTS BY
URBAN/RURAL CLASSIFICATION

S.No.	Place	Number			Percent		
		Urban	Rural	All places	Urban	Rural	All places
1.	Hazara District	12	5	17	3.53	0.76	1.73
2.	Mardan "	41	45	86	12.39	6.86	8.71
3.	Peshawar "	134	354	488	40.46	53.97	49.44
4.	Kohat "	27	44	71	8.16	6.71	7.19
5.	D.I. Khan"	-	13	13	-	1.98	1.32
6.	Bannu "	13	-	13	3.93	-	1.32
7.	Campbellpur"	11	12	23	3.32	1.83	2.33
8.	Rawalpindi "	1	3	4	0.30	0.46	0.41
9.	Jhelum "	1	-	1	0.30	-	0.10
10.	Gujrat "	-	1	1	-	0.15	0.10
11.	Sargodha "	3	3	6	0.91	0.46	0.61
12.	Lahore "	10	-	10	3.02	-	1.01
13.	Gujrantwala"	-	2	2	-	0.30	0.20
14.	Sialkot "	2	5	7	0.60	0.76	0.71
15.	D.I.Khan "	-	1	1	-	0.10	0.15
16.	Hyderabad "	-	-	-	-	-	-
17.	Karachi "	3	-	3	0.91	-	0.30
18.	Quetta "	-	12	12	-	1.83	1.22
19.	Azad Kashmir	-	3	3	-	0.46	0.30
20.	Malakwal	-	13	13	-	2.75	1.83
21.	Mahmad Agency	-	80	86	1.81	12.20	8.71
22.	Khyber "	-	8	8	-	1.22	0.81
23.	North Wazirestan	-	1	1	-	0.15	0.10
24.	Sowth Wazirestan	5	-	5	1.51	-	0.51
25.	Swat	20	13	33	6.04	1.98	3.34
26.	Chitral	2	13	15	0.50	1.98	1.52
27.	Dir	9	15	24	2.72	2.29	2.43
28.	Bongladesh	3	1	4	0.91	0.15	0.41
29.	India	5	2	7	1.51	0.30	0.71
30.	Afghanistan	22	1	23	6.65	0.15	2.33
31.	Tanzania	1	1	2	0.30	0.15	0.20
All Places		321	656	957	100.00	100.00	100.00

This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution - Noncommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 Licence.

To view a copy of the licence please see:
<http://creativecommons.Org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>