SOME ASPECTS OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR MIGRATION IN SIX COMMUNITIES IN RURAL EGYPT IN THE EARLY 1990s

NADER FERGANY
June 1993

INTRODUCTION

This report investigates elements of the social structure of six Egyptian villages and how it articulates with the phenomenon of international labor migration on the basis of household surveys carried out near the end of 1992.

The six communities were chosen for the study on " The Impact of Labor Migration on the Rural Economy and Society " on the basis of a number of criteria including size as well as indicators of the extent of rurality and level of out migration (e.g. the sex ratio) from census returns in the two major rural regions of the country, Lower and Upper Egypt, as outlined in the sample selection report.
It is to be noted that the detailed results of the 1986 census were not available at the time of sample selection. What was available, on the village level from that census, at the time of sample selection was only population count by sex.
In general, Upper Egypt is the more traditional and less developed of the two regions. Further, as a result of lack of economic opportunities, upper Egypt has traditionally been an (internal) emigration area long before international labor migration became a significant phenomenon in the Egyptian countryside.

The chosen villages, in descending order of population size within governorates, are: E'ta'iba, E'danabeek and Shobra-bedain in A'dakahlia governorate in the Delta region and Abshak, Deir-Asankoria and Brdonet-Alashraf in Elmenya governorate of Upper Egypt.
To facilitate reference, the two governorates will be denoted D and M. The six villages will be denoted Dl, Dm, Ds, Ml, Mm, and Ms, respectively, the second letter in the village code denotes village size within triplet: large, medium and small.

In each triplet of villages the medium and small villages were completely covered in the household survey while a 50% sample of the households of the largest village was surveyed, The surveys covered 5092 households in the six villages.

The global analysis presented here serves as a backdrop for the detailed investigation of international labor migration and its impact on the rural economy and society based on the specialized research instruments administered in the study.

The Annex to this report contains the analytical tables referred to in the text. In many tables, only the significant categories are shown.

BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY COMMUNITIES

This section relies mainly on data from the, now available, results of the 1986 population census to portray some major socio-economic characteristics of the six villages studied in comparison to the rural areas of the two chosen governorates and rural Egypt at large. See table (2).

The population of the largest of the two triplets of villages was in the neighbourhood of 10,000 inhabitants in 1986. The medium size village had roughly one half that population size and the smallest about one quarter.

Agricultural employment can be taken as a measure of rurality. The proportion of the work force engaged in agriculture was generally higher in M than D as expected. However, the ratio declined with decreasing size in the D triplet, indicating that size is not a good proxy of rurality for these three villages. In M, the ratio does increase on going from Ml to Mm but declines in Ms. In other words, size is clearly not a good indicator of rurality in the D triplet in general and the smallest village in M seems to have a lower level of rurality than indicated by its size.

Household size is, in general, strongly related with rurality.
Average household size in the M triplet was higher than the value for M as a whole and exhibited the expected increasing trend with diminishing size of the village between Ml and Mm.
In D, the smallest village breaks the expected pattern of household size, with an average household size significantly smaller than the larger two, an anomalous situation indicating departure from rurality congruent with such small size.

Illiteracy was generally higher in M than D. The internal pattern of illiteracy within each triplet was contrary to expectation. Dl exhibited higher illiteracy than its smaller companions and Ms showed lower illiteracy than the two larger villages in M.

Participation of females in (organized) economic activity was higher in D than M in general and increased with smaller population size in the former. It was also relatively higher than expected in Ms, reversing the trend between Ml and Mm. These are further confirmation of departures from the expected pattern if village size was inversely related to rurality.

All in all, it appears that size of the village should not be taken even as an (inverse) indicator of rurality in the D and M triplets. In D, contrary to expectations, size seems positively related to indicators of rurality. Ms breaks the pattern of rurality according to village size observed between Mm and Ms.

The three villages of D were predominantly Muslim, consonant with the pattern in rural D. On the other hand, Ml showed 11% Christian population while Mm had 22%, higher than the average for rural M in general.

In the absence of enumeration errors, a relatively low sex ratio (males / females) of the population is normally taken as an indication of out migration of unaccompanied males.
In all six villages, the sex ratio was lower than the values of rural areas of D, M and Egypt as a whole, indicating higher than average incidence of out migration.
On the basis of this indicator, out migration of unaccompanied males seems to have decreased with declining village size in D but was considerably higher in the smaller two villages in M than Ml as well as in the two corresponding villages in D. Dl is indicated to have the highest incidence of out migration in the six villages studied.

the rest of this report is based on the household surveys carried out in the study communities.

CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSEHOLDS AND INDIVIDUALS

I Households

As might be expected, the number of households in a residential ' building ' was generally larger in D than M indicating higher prevalence of multiple-household buildings, a non-rural housing style, table (3).
The average number of households per residential building did not increase with population size in D, to the contrary it declined slightly. Judging by that measure, ' urbanization ' has reached all three villages in D almost equally regardless of size. Actually the largest number of households per building was recorded in Ds (8) and the same parameter was equal to 6 for both Dl and Dm. The M villages conform more closely to the rural norm of one household per building (only the largest village deviated from this norm to any considerable extent).
The maximum number of households per building was generally smaller in M, than D, and it increased steadily with population size. This seems to be more a large-numbers phenomenon than an indication of rurality.

Family type is a major determinant of social structure, as well as level or rurality.
Nuclear families constituted more than 70% of the households in the villages of the study, table (4). The proportion of nuclear families increased with declining village size in D and was slightly lower in Ms than its two companion villages in the M triplet. This last observation is explained, in part, by the fact that Ms showed the largest incidence of joint families in the six villages.

Another variable indicative of social structure is size of the household. Average size of the household in the six villages was in the range of 5 to 6 individuals, table (5). While the M villages exhibited the expected pattern of declining average household size with the population of the village, the pattern was reversed in D.
Maximum household size declined steadily from 25 in Dl to 18 in Ds while it rose from 21 in Ml to 27 in Ms.

Tabulation of household members by relationship to the head of the household reveals that D villages, particularly Dl and Dm, are characterized by slightly higher prevalence of extended families. Ds stands out again as deviating from the expected pattern if its small size is to express extreme rurality, table (6).

These observations, based on the household surveys, show that the three villages of D do not conform to the gradation of social structure, showing increasing rurality, expected in three villages of significantly varying sizes as generally exhibited by the M villages. In particular, contrary to expectation, Ds shows more ' urban ' character than the other two D villages.

Rental of housing units was almost non existent in M. In D it was rare (about 2.6% of all households), table (7). In both triplets, the smallest village showed a significantly lower level of housing unit rental. Related to this characteristic is the relative frequency of multi-story residential buildings: unknown in M and Ds and representing only 2-4% in the larger two villages in D.

Another distinguishing feature between D and M in terms of the type of residential building is the proportion of mud brick or stone structures, much higher in D, table (8). Ds had the largest incidence of mud-brick houses in D as well as the highest proportion of the most ' urban ' building style: plastered red-brick walls, in the six villages indicating a polarized distribution of wealth. Judging by the type of residential buildings, Ms seems to have a higher socio-economic standard than the two larger villages in its triplet. It has the smallest proportion of mud-brick houses and the largest incidence of urban style residential buildings.

Land holding is a major characteristic of socio-economic structure in rural communities.
proportion of land-holding households was in excess of 60% in the two triplets, slightly higher in M than D, table (9). Dl and Mm had significantly higher land holding ratios than the two other villages in their triplets.

Size of holding was rather small in the six communities. Average holding per household was in the neighborhood of 1.5 feddan (1 feddan = 0.42 hectare),. Average holding was a little higher, increasing slightly and getting more unequal with diminishing size of community, in the D villages,

table (10). Ms showed a slightly higher average holding than the larger two villages in M. Only one large holding of 101 feddans was reported in Ms.

The vast majority of land holding in M was through ownership and about a quarter through renting, table (11).
The situation was mixed in D. Only Dm had a land ownership ratio similar to M villages. About half of the average holding in Ds was owned while roughly three quarters of the average holding was rented in Dl.

Ownership of agricultural equipment was much higher in M than D (21% compared to 3% of households), Table (12), and the type of equipment owned varies between the triplets, table (13). In M and Dl, more than 90% of the households owning equipment acquired irrigation pumps. In the two larger villages of D there was a relative prevalence of the more expensive tractors.

Based on the previous analysis, the social structure of the study communities differed considerably between the two triplets, varied significantly within each triplet, and did not reflect increasing rurality with decreasing population size as anticipated in sample selection particularly in D.

II Individuals

The household schedules administered in the survey covered about 29 thousand individuals in the six communities under study distributed as shown in table (14). It is to be remembered that the largest of the villages chosen in both D and M were sampled at 50% to yield approximately 1000 households in each case. This size was designed to ensure catching a reasonable number of international labor migrants and provides ample statistical base for establishing the socio-economic characteristics of the sampled communities.

The study communities generally exhibited a young age structure commensurate with high fertility, about 40% of the population of the six villages aged less than 15 years at the time of the survey.

The two triplets of villages differed, however, on an important demographic indicator: the sex ratio (males per 100 females), which was generally higher than the values derived from the 1986 census and, contrary to the census pattern, higher in M than D in general, table (15). These differentials probably mean a higher level of undercounting of females in the household surveys than the census, particularly in M and preclude the use of the sex ration derived from the household surveys as an indicator of out migration (note that the definition of membership in the household in the surveys includes current migrants).

Educational achievement and school attendance were significantly higher in D than M, tables (16 - 18). Nevertheless, important differences obtained within triplets. While Dl was considerably inferior to the two other D villages in the educational attainment of older generations, the three villages were roughly comparable in terms of current school enrollment. Dm and Ds were quite close on indicators of educational achievement.
In M, Ms stands out with considerably higher educational achievement than the two other M villages, for both old and young.
An interesting observation in the area of education is a much higher prevalence of religious education in D than M(11% compared to less than 3% in M), particularly in Dl and Dm (about 13%). In M, religious education was relatively widespread in Ms (7%) while it was, understandably, nonexistent in Mm and limited in Ml (1%).

Approximately one third of the population was economically active in the study communities, table (19). However, activity rates were higher in D than M, particularly in the smaller two villages of the triplets, on account of a higher level of participation in economic activity by females. Ds shows a relatively low economic activity rate evidently due to a higher than average proportion of the population enrolled in education relative to the D communities. An opposite reasoning explains the higher than average activity rate for Mm.

The striking difference between the D and M villages in the area of employment is with regard to unemployment rates, averaging 15% of the labor force in the first and only 5% in the latter. The pattern in unemployment rates within triplet is not clearly linked to size of the village, Dm had the highest rate while Mm had the smallest, in the six villages .

Unpaid employment within the household in the main economic activity was more prevalent in M than D, table (20). This is another sensitive indicator of traditional social structures in general and rurality in particular. It confirms the pattern of rurality between and within the two triplets of villages recognized earlier on the basis of other indicators. On the basis of this indicator as well, rurality declines with declining village size in D and Ms breaks the opposite pattern in M.

Naturally, waged employment is shown to be more prevalent in D than M but Dl and Ms come out as relative outliers, the first with the lowest proportion of waged employment in its triplet and the latter with the highest.

The D villages are shown to have a more varied occupational structure in the main economic activity than their M counterparts. This observation carries to the assessed differences in rurality within triplets of villages. For example, 63% of the employed were engaged in agricultural occupations in M

compared to only 43% in D, table (21). DI had the highest ratio of agricultural occupations in D and Ms had the lowest ratio in its triplet.
Ms had a higher prevalence of professional, technical, clerical and service occupations than its two counterparts indicating a more developed economic structure. A similar, though less prominent, position is taken by Ds. DI and Mm had a relative concentration of construction workers.
Once more, the occupational structures are consonant with the characterization of social structure documented earlier.

The surveys included questions related to the presence and characteristics of secondary jobs. Experience shows that it is difficult to collect data on multiple job-holding in a questionnaire-based survey. However, the differentials revealed by the surveys are interesting. Contrary to the pattern of multiple job holding expected on the basis of social structure, reporting of secondary jobs was higher in M than D (13% compared to 7%), table (22). This probably reflects a higher level of candor in upper Egypt and the more rural communities in general.
Ds had an astronomically high level of reported moonlighting compared to DI (14 to 1) emphasizing the urban character of the former, particularly if we take into account that the level of under reporting is probably relatively higher in it.

Although the data are weak in this regard, general indications of multiple job holding can be discerned.
The need, and probably the ability, to take up a second job seems to have been more widespread in D than M, significant proportions of a larger number of occupational groups reported second jobs in the former, table (23). In M for example, the majority of secondary job holders originated in agriculture, while the corresponding ratio in D did not exceed 25%. This is probably a result of a more difficult economic situation as well as a more varied economic structure in D compared to M.
In both triplets of villages though, more than two thirds of secondary jobs were in agricultural work. The only other occupational group accounting for more than 10% of secondary jobs in the two triplets was self employment. In D, only service occupations in secondary jobs approached that mark.

Expectedly, employment in the same village was higher in M than D (77% to 66%), table (24). On the other hand, employment in the capital of the governorate, almost non existent in M and Ds, was quite prevalent in the larger two villages of D (about one fifth of employed persons). Clearly, DI and Ds served as dormitory villages for employees in the capital of D, Mansourah. A much weaker tendency for work in the capital of the district, unknown in D, is found in M, particularly Ms and MI.

Employment in other governorates of Egypt did not exceed 1% in both governorates, an indication of a very low level of internal labor migration.

MIGRATION

Size of migration

The household questionnaire comprised questions relating to the basic parameters of both internal and international migration.

Household membership was defined to include current migrants who would " live in the household when they return ". Thus, the survey covered current as well as return migrants, i.e. ever-migrants.

Internal migration is shown to have been extremely rare. Less than 0.37% of the population of the six villages had ever migrated within the country, table (25). In D, internal migration was almost unheard of at about 0.15% of the population. Even in M, long known as a push area in upper Egypt, the incidence of internal migration goes up to a negligible 0.58% of the population.

International migration has, however, been quite prevalent. Nearly 12% of the total population of the study communities experienced international migration, 11.3% as workers and the remaining small fraction as accompanying dependents. Only 3% of international migrants have been dependents. In other words, international migration has been almost totally of the unaccompanied worker type.

If we restrict consideration to males above 15 years of age, the incidence of international labor migration increases considerably, to about 38% of the total population in the six communities, a major phenomenon that must have had far reaching consequences for the communities concerned.

Current migration at the time of the surveys was still significant at about 28% of the total volume of ever-migration, or 3% of the total population.

Henceforth, investigation of migration is restricted to international migration.

The incidence of international migration has been uniform over both the D and M villages taken together, as well as the three villages of D, but occurred in Mm at a higher than the average for M (about 14%).
The major conclusion here is that the observed differences in social structure between the six study communities were not related to the level of incidence of international labor migration. As indicated by the results of the household surveys, international labor migration in the six study communities seems to have been a constant not influenced by the socio-economic characteristics of the villages.
The relatively high level of emigration of Mm is the result of a pattern of repeated migrations to Jordan of rather short duration.

The incidence of current migration was also rather uniform over both the D and M villages taken together. However, more variability is observed in the incidence of current migration at the time of the surveys within triplets compared to the case of ever-migration. Ds shows the highest incidence of current migration in the six villages at 7.6% of the total population, Mm shows the next highest level (4.7%) and Dm had the lowest level in its triplet as well as across the six villages.

Among the employed members of the labor force at the time of the surveys, current international migration reached 13.5%, was slightly higher in M than D (14% to 13%), table (26). Mm and Ds showed the highest rates of current international migration at the time of the survey (19% and 17% respectively). Some emigrants from Ds seem to have specialized in an unusual and difficult destination: Lebanon.
By contrast the lowest rate of current international migration was observed in Dm.

At the time of the surveys, major countries of current migration were, in order, Saudi Arabia, Libya and Jordan. By that time, emigration to Iraq, the first country of destination of earlier times, had declined drastically.
Nevertheless, there were clear patterns of specialization by destination, reflecting the presence of particular migration experiences and the existence of migration networks. Migrants from Ds, Ml and Ms specialized in Saudi Arabia, from Mm and Ms in Libya, and from Dl in Jordan.

The virtual elimination of the former first country of destination, Iraq, as a result of the Gulf crisis stands as the main explanation for differences in the patterns of ever-migration and current migration.

Comparing the level of incidence of international labor migration to the rates of unemployment reported earlier, shows that the two phenomena are not related in the six communities studied. International labor migration seems to have been an employment constant not related to the level of open unemployment.

The majority of migrants were one-time migrants, particularly in D. The village of the highest incidence of migration, Mm, stands out as an exception with two thirds of its migrants having multiple migrations, table (28). In D, Ds shows a stronger tendency towards multiple migrations compared to its counterparts. The average number of migrations was in the neighborhood of 1.4 in all the study communities with the exception of Ds (1.7) and Mm (2.1).

Onset of migration

Migration started in the study communities as early as the mid 1960s. the latest emigrations recorded in the surveys, took place in 1991, table (28).

Multiple migrations implied an early start for the migration activity. On average multiple migrants started their first migration in the early 1980s. Last migrations are reported to have started in the late 1980s, on average in 1987-88.
One-time migrants started only in the mid 1980s, on average in 1984-87.

In other words, migration out of the study communities started only in the 1980s and the majority started later in the decade, i.e. much later than the explosion of labor migration in the country as a whole in the mid 1970s.

The peak of first emigration of multiple migrants spanned 1980 to 1985 in D and was concentrated in 1985-88 in the case of M.
The peak of emigration, out of both the D and M villages, is shown to have taken place in 1985-91 for one-time migrants, and in 1987-91 in the case of last migration of multiple migrants.

Country of immigration

Iraq comes out as the first country of destination for emigrants in the study communities, although its relative share declines between the first and last migration of multiple migrants reflecting the dwindling fortunes of migrants to Iraq near the end of the 1980s, table (29). Second place was occupied interchangeably by Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Libya came in third or fourth place.

Evidence of networks leading to specialization in countries of destination is plentiful. Emigration to Libya was almost limited to M. Emigrants from Dm and Mm had a preference for Jordan and those from Dl, Ml and Ms were relatively more concentrated in Saudi Arabia. Ds consistently sent a small contingent of migrants to Lebanon.

Duration of migration

One time migrants stayed abroad longer, on average, than multiple migrants per migration. An indication that one time migrants might have been more successful.

Duration of the single migration ranged between less than one month and 16 years, table (30). Mm stands out with an exceptionally short average duration

of a little over than one year, with relatively small variability and the maximum duration reported was only four years.
On average, migrants from the larger villages stayed slightly longer and M migrants, excluding Mm, stayed longer than those of D.

For multiple migrants, last migration was generally shorter than the first. This is expected since migrations subsequent to the first are normally more targeted.

Total duration of all migrations ranged from less than one month to a maximum of 17 years. M migrants spent, on average, a longer period abroad than those from D. In the two triplets, migrants from the smallest village stayed the longest and those from the medium size village stayed shortest.

All in all, a migrant from the study communities spent abroad an average of two to three years. M migrants stayed longer than D migrants in all size classes and migrants from the medium size villages stayed a shorter period than those from the two other villages in each triplet.

Time of return

Return of one time migrants started in 1970, picked up in the 1980s and had a noticeable peak in 1989-90 coinciding with massive return waves from Iraq after the end of the Iraq-Iran war, table (31).
Average year of return fell in the period 1986-87 for all the study communities indicating that return was related to external conditions affecting destinations, probably as a result of the bust in the oil market in the early 1980s, with the time delay expected in such situations, in addition to the return from Iraq mentioned above.

For multiple migrants, first return took place in 1967 in the case of first migration and in 1974 for last migration. Average date of return fell in the period 1983-85 for the first migration and in the period 1987-88 in the case of their last migration. Again there was little variation among the study communities. Peaks of return from first migration took place in the second half of the 1980s. Return from last migration was more concentrated in the peak period of 1989-91.

Occupational structure and occupational mobility

The occupational structure of migrants was generally more varied in D than M, table (32), a reflection of differences in the overall occupation structures in the study communities.

Two major differences are observed in the occupational distribution of one time migrants between the two triplets of villages. One relates to the ratio of the unemployed, about double in D. Unemployment was especially high in Dm and Ds.
The other difference pertains to the proportion of agricultural workers. Among those employed, more than three quarters of migrants from M were agricultural laborers, with little variability among the three villages. In D, however, the proportion of agricultural laborers was only slightly higher than half, with DI having a significantly larger ratio.

Those differences are accentuated in the occupational distribution of multiple migrants. Larger differentials in unemployment and the proportion of agricultural workers are observed between the two triplets in both first and last migrations, though at a lower overall level in the case of unemployment.

The occupational structure is transformed during migration, table (33). For one, unemployment vanishes. Agricultural employment is drastically reduced, particularly for D migrants. Only MI migrants exhibited a sizable level of employment in agriculture. In contrast, construction becomes the largest employer, especially for MI, Mm and DI migrants. the rest of the migrants are mostly employed in ordinary production and services jobs.

The occupational structure during migration differs significantly between the first migration of multiple migrants on one hand, and one time migrants and the last migration of multiple migrants, on the other hand. In the former, construction claims a larger share of migrants mostly at the expense of agricultural occupations. This shift reflects changes in the regional labor market in which the construction sector was quite labor intensive at the beginning as well as the opening up of employment opportunities in ordinary production and services occupations in Iraq and Jordan in the second half of the 1980s. A significant component of employment of Egyptians in Jordan was in agriculture.

Migrants who were originally unemployed had an occupational pattern different from previously employed migrants. The unemployed tended to work more in services and less in construction. A pattern related to the relative prevalence of education among the unemployed.

The migration experience is shown to have contributed to significant occupational mobility with the pattern of mobility depending on whether the migrant was employed or not prior to emigration, area of origin and timing of migration, tables (34 - 35).
The vast majority of agricultural workers prior to emigration returned back to the same occupation, more so in M the D, more so in the case of one time migrants than the case of the last migration of multiple migrants.
(occupation after return from first migration in the case of multiple migrants was not collected in the household survey).
In other words, migrants from D showed a slightly higher withdrawal from agricultural work than those from M, which might be expected in view of the overall difference in development between the two governorates and the greater diversity in economic structure in D than M.
Also, later emigrations seem to have resulted in a slightly reduced level of occupational mobility. this probably more a result of the economic stagnation in Egypt that set-in in the early eighties.

Agricultural workers prior to migration who did not return back to agriculture stayed in some of the occupations they held during migration with a relative preference for construction among one time migrants, a corollary of the relative selectivity of construction for migrants in the earlier phases of migration.

The previously unemployed migrants are shown to have been all employed on return. their occupational structure after return is much more varied than average reflecting their higher level of education.
A small minority, higher in M, was employed in agriculture. A large proportion was employed in clerical and professional occupations.

In the case of multiple migrants, investigation of the distribution of occupation prior to first migration and occupation prior to last migration leads to interesting dimensions of the multiple migrations process, table (36).

Agricultural workers prior to the first migration were found in the same occupational group before their last migration. In other words, migrations preceding the last did not lead to occupational mobility. It is likely that multiple migrants had severely limited economic activity choices inside the country even after their first migration(s). Remigration seems to have been a more desirable alternative to the agricultural work.

A similar, though less forceful conclusion, holds with regard to migrants unemployed prior to the their first migration. The majority, larger in D, was also unemployed before last migration. About 10% found their way to clerical work. In M, about a quarter were employed as agricultural workers.
Again, remigration seems to have been a more desirable alternative to staying in the country.

Thus, it appears that multiple migration was more an expression of dissatisfaction with internal employment opportunities as well as a result of failure to attain migration targets in previous migrations.

ANNEX: ANALYTICAL TABLES

Table (1)
Number of Households Surveyed

Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
864	1031	521	1119	1084	473

Table (3)
Number of Households in Building

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	864	1.31	0.77	1.00	6.00
Dm	1031	1.39	0.76	1.00	6.00
Ds	521	1.42	0.83	1.00	8.00
Ml	1119	1.16	0.45	1.00	4.00
Mm	1084	1.04	0.22	1.00	3.00
Ms	473	1.04	0.19	1.00	2.00

Table (4)
Percentage of Nuclear Families

Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
67.71	71.77	81.38	75.69	75.83	68.08

Table (5)
Number of Members of the Household

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	864	6.30	3.36	1.00	25.00
Dm	1031	5.74	2.85	1.00	21.00
Ds	521	5.30	2.47	1.00	18.00
Ml	1119	5.36	2.85	1.00	21.00
Mm	1084	5.56	2.64	1.00	19.00
Ms	473	6.38	3.57	1.00	27.00

Table (2)

Socio- economic Characteristics of Study Communities

Compared to Rural D, Rural M, and Rural Egypt,

1986 Census Data

Unit	POPULATION SIZE			NUMBER OF HOUSE-HOLDS	HOUSE-HOLD SIZE	SEX RATIO %	ILLITERACY RATIO (10+) %			CHRISTIANS RATIO %			FEMALES IN LABOR FORCE	AGRICULTURAL WORKERS (6+) %		
	M	F	T				M	F	T	M	F	T	%	M	F	T
DI	5541	6058	11599	2178	5.33	91.47	51.76	76.10	64.73	0.04	0.03	0.03	5.85	74.59	9.62	73.21
Dm	2812	2955	5767	1043	5.53	95.16	31.56	61.80	47.04	0.00	0.03	0.02	7.85	71.00	7.84	68.18
Ds	1309	1339	2648	619	4.28	97.76	36.13	63.94	50.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.06	68.25	21.43	65.97
Rural D	1310474	1255535	2566009	498482	5.15	104.38	40.20	67.62	53.66	0.48	0.48	0.48	8.19	62.53	26.96	60.61
MI	4900	4855	9755	1873	5.21	100.93	56.14	87.39	71.92	11.02	10.88	10.95	2.70	74.13	19.15	73.01
Mm	2453	2661	5114	925	5.53	92.18	62.72	92.56	78.65	22.01	22.25	22.14	1.52	83.33	40.00	82.76
Ms	1298	1397	2695	480	5.61	92.91	38.53	80.52	60.71	1.93	1.43	1.67	3.36	66.40	30.00	65.67
Rural M	1066020	1026836	2092856	425085	4.92	103.82	57.12	87.07	71.82	17.94	17.85	17.90	3.40	79.80	42.47	78.74
Rural Egypt	13800424	13238310	27038734	5147230	5.25	104.25	46.91	76.94	61.65	4.44	4.40	4.42	5.69	65.84	35.17	64.51

Table (6)

Relation to Head of the Household (%)

	Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
Household head	15.84	17.41	18.82	18.62	17.99	15.74
Wife	14.28	14.44	15.25	15.20	16.18	12.98
Son	27.13	28.92	28.83	29.19	29.88	29.58
Daughter	20.27	20.45	23.52	20.74	22.66	20.92
Father or Mother	2.89	2.92	3.58	2.83	2.73	3.25
Son or Daughter in law	3.80	3.38	1.26	2.65	2.24	2.36
Grandchild	8.79	6.37	2.53	4.93	3.37	5.41
Brother	2.74	2.63	2.64	2.05	1.83	2.62
Brother's family	2.30	1.69	0.76	2.05	1.55	4.15
Sister	1.45	1.13	2.35	1.30	1.10	1.59
Other relations	0.51	0.68	0.47	0.43	0.48	1.39

Table (7)

Percentage of Households Owing Housing Unit

Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
97.11	96.70	99.42	99.37	99.54	100.00

Table (8)

Type of Building Material of Housing Unit (%)

	Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
Mud brick	31.02	20.66	40.12	53.26	58.03	51.16
Red brick and Stone	66.90	75.85	59.69	46.74	41.79	48.63

Table (9)

Percentage of Households Holding Land

Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
69.68	57.32	58.73	60.50	73.89	63.85

Table (10)
Size of Land Holding
(Feddan)

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	602	1.30	1.57	0.08	32.00
Dm	591	1.55	1.36	0.04	12.58
Ds	306	1.52	2.08	0.08	20.00
Ml	677	1.57	1.49	0.17	15.00
Mm	801	1.55	1.95	0.08	20.00
Ms	303	1.89	6.11	0.04	101.21

Table (11)
Percentage Owned of Land Holding

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	602	0.30	1.44	0.00	30.00
Dm	591	1.23	1.28	0.00	12.17
Ds	306	0.80	1.58	0.00	13.00
Ml	677	1.13	1.36	0.00	15.00
Mm	801	1.22	1.75	0.00	20.00
Ms	303	1.44	6.07	0.00	101.21

Table (12)
Percentage of Households Owing
Agricultural Equipment

Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
3.71	2.42	4.04	19.12	21.13	24.31

Table (13)
Type of Agricultural Equipment Owned By Households (%)

	Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
Tractor	9.38	40.00	47.62	3.26	4.78	1.74
Pump	90.63	56.00	47.62	89.77	91.74	93.91

Table (14)
Number of Individuals Surveyed

DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
5441	5923	2768	5999	6015	3012

Table (15)
Sex Ratio (%)

DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
102.01	103.86	103.68	108.01	105.12	106.44

Table (16)
Educational Status (%)

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
Under School Age	19.04	14.01	17.23	22.65	26.47	19.02
In School	25.23	26.93	25.43	19.19	13.15	24.87
Illiterate	43.10	24.41	23.99	46.66	50.64	36.79
Never Been to School	2.44	2.33	4.19	1.43	1.40	2.22
Finished School	10.18	32.31	29.15	10.07	8.35	17.10

Table (17)

Years of Schooling (Persons in schools)

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	1373	5.54	3.47	1.00	18.00
Dm	1594	6.11	3.54	1.00	17.00
Ds	703	6.11	3.62	1.00	16.00
Ml	1151	5.85	3.62	1.00	17.00
Mm	790	5.45	3.64	1.00	15.00
Ms	749	5.99	3.77	1.00	16.00

Years of Schooling (Person who finished school)

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	553	11.57	2.81	1.00	18.00
Dm	1912	8.99	4.24	1.00	20.00
Ds	805	9.25	3.82	1.00	18.00
Ml	604	10.55	3.65	1.00	18.00
Mm	502	8.05	4.02	1.00	23.00
Ms	515	8.43	4.45	1.00	22.00

Table (18)

Type of Education (%)

	Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
General	55.11	54.67	61.67	68.42	77.17	65.11
Religious	13.44	13.39	4.11	1.20	0.00	7.44
Commercial	15.52	10.36	16.91	10.43	5.19	8.15

Table (19)

Employment Characteristics

	Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
Activity Rate %	33.00	37.00	38.00	32.00	34.00	28.00
Housewives %	31.00	25.00	26.00	36.00	42.00	35.00
Students %	31.00	31.00	30.00	25.00	18.00	31.00
Unemployment %	15.00	19.60	6.70	7.90	2.70	4.30

Table (20)
Work Status (%)

	Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
Agricultural Worker, Waged	44.35	64.37	63.60	48.82	41.17	54.42
Agricultural Worker, Self Employed	37.81	14.17	16.52	19.28	25.07	14.26
Agricultural Worker, Employer	0.74	6.50	2.36	4.87	9.44	7.75
Un waged Household Worker	13.42	9.12	7.08	17.87	18.21	15.81

Table (21)
Main Occupation (%)

	Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
1 Agriculture	56.06	36.63	34.58	62.78	67.60	51.63
4 Production	3.19	7.05	2.87	0.44	5.91	4.34
5 Services	9.98	14.69	17.35	7.02	4.28	9.92
6 Construction	9.98	3.82	1.37	3.10	10.12	2.95
7 Technical	4.99	7.44	6.87	2.73	1.70	4.96
8 Self Employment	2.54	3.82	7.12	8.42	4.28	5.58
9 Clerical	6.87	11.99	12.23	9.08	2.11	8.84
11 Professional	3.85	9.29	6.74	4.51	1.43	6.05

Table (22)
Number of Persons Reporting Secondary Jobs

	Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
Total	13	119	113	207	170	78

Table (23)
Main and secondry Occupation

D

	1	5	8	All
1 Agriculture	23	11	14	58
5 Services	32	6	2	43
7 Technical	21	0	2	26
9 Clerical	19	2	5	33
10 Security	24	1	0	28
All Occupations	162	23	30	245

M

1 Agriculture	159	13	35	256
9 Clerical	33	3	11	48
All Occupations	324	20	53	455

Table (24)
Location of Main Job (%)

	Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
Same village	61.81	61.24	74.80	76.51	79.14	73.72
Capital of Same Governorate	17.59	20.25	0.90	0.07	0.00	0.78
Other Governorate	0.72	1.12	0.16	2.95	0.41	1.56
Outside Egypt	12.27	7.95	17.10	9.82	19.09	11.20

Table (25)
Migration Experience (%)

	Dl	Dm	Ds	Ml	Mm	Ms
Never Migrated	88.29	87.27	87.97	89.58	86.07	88.91
Internal	0.06	0.22	0.07	0.93	0.08	0.37
External	11.60	11.43	11.31	9.08	13.85	9.96
Both, Internal and External	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.22	0.00	0.07
Both, as a dependent	0.06	1.05	0.61	0.18	0.00	0.70

Table (26)

Share of Main Countries of Current Migration (%)

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
Jordan	5.97	1.37	0.98	1.26	6.52	0.31
Saudi Arabia	2.76	0.37	13.18	7.46	0.41	5.44
Iraq	0.59	1.12	1.80	0.30	1.36	0.31
Libya	1.77	0.62	0.25	0.89	10.67	5.13
All Destinations	187	64	209	134	281	73

Table (27)

Distribution of Number of Migrations (%)

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
One	62.06	69.91	55.73	69.42	36.49	68.77
Tow	31.75	25.66	30.25	23.20	31.21	24.58
Three	3.97	3.39	9.24	6.12	18.73	5.32
Four	1.59	0.44	2.87	0.90	9.96	1.33
Five	0.63	0.59	1.91	0.36	3.60	0.00

Number of Migrations

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
DI	630	1.47	0.71	1.00	5.00
Dm	678	1.36	0.63	1.00	5.00
Ds	314	1.67	1.02	1.00	9.00
MI	556	1.40	0.69	1.00	6.00
Mm	833	2.14	1.15	1.00	7.00
Ms	301	1.39	0.65	1.00	4.00

Table (28)

Date of Migration

(i) One-time Migrants

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	391	86.17	3.94	76.00	91.00
Dm	472	85.86	3.94	65.00	91.00
Ds	173	85.44	3.60	75.00	91.00
Ml	386	84.08	4.22	69.00	91.00
Mm	304	86.84	4.71	72.00	91.00
Ms	207	84.94	4.08	73.00	91.00

(ii) First migration, multiple migrants

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	239	83.22	3.47	75.00	90.00
Dm	203	83.31	3.52	73.00	90.00
Ds	139	82.40	3.21	67.00	90.00
Ml	170	81.39	4.43	70.00	89.00
Mm	529	82.46	4.58	68.00	89.00
Ms	94	81.62	4.64	70.00	89.00

(iii) Last migration, multiple migrants

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	239	88.34	2.85	78.00	91.00
Dm	204	87.40	3.39	74.00	91.00
Ds	138	86.80	2.54	79.00	91.00
Ml	170	86.71	3.49	74.00	91.00
Mm	529	88.39	3.14	74.00	91.00
Ms	94	87.13	3.57	73.00	91.00

Table (29)

Migration Country (%)

(i) One-time Migrants

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
Jordan	4.09	41.35	7.43	11.66	17.11	1.93
Saudi Arabia	47.06	14.98	2.86	32.38	0.99	20.77
Iraq	45.52	31.01	66.86	43.01	43.09	57.00
Lebanon	2.05	1.05	12.57	0.00	0.00	0.00
Libya	0.51	5.91	2.29	12.44	38.16	17.87
Other Arab Countries	0.77	4.64	8.00	0.52	0.66	2.42
Non Arab Countries	0.00	1.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

(ii) First migration, multiple migrants

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
Jordan	2.51	53.43	7.19	11.18	26.84	3.19
Saudi Arabia	26.78	6.37	1.44	8.82	0.76	23.40
Iraq	65.27	31.37	76.98	51.76	48.39	51.06
Lebanon	5.02	4.41	11.51	0.00	0.00	0.00
Libya	0.42	2.94	0.72	27.06	24.01	22.34
Other Arab Countries	0.00	1.47	2.16	1.18	0.00	0.00

(iii) Last migration, multiple migrants

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
Jordan	2.51	36.76	8.70	10.59	27.79	1.06
Saudi Arabia	69.46	18.14	5.80	43.53	1.51	31.91
Iraq	25.94	30.39	63.04	38.24	33.46	36.17
Lebanon	0.42	0.98	13.77	0.00	0.00	0.00
Libya	0.42	8.82	3.62	7.06	37.24	29.79
Other Arab Countries	1.26	4.41	3.62	0.59	0.00	1.06
Non Arab Countries	0.00	0.49	1.45	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table (30)

Migration period (months)

(i) One-time Migrants

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	391	28.31	29.16	0.00	156.00
Dm	474	22.68	21.77	0.00	180.00
Ds	175	23.49	22.48	2.00	156.00
Ml	386	36.23	31.87	2.00	192.00
Mm	304	13.55	9.29	1.00	48.00
Ms	207	31.53	26.02	3.00	168.00

(ii) First migration, multiple migrants

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	240	22.06	18.07	0.00	120.00
Dm	205	16.99	16.15	0.00	108.00
Ds	139	18.72	15.70	2.00	120.00
Ml	170	22.58	16.94	3.00	120.00
Mm	529	15.80	8.87	2.00	110.00
Ms	94	28.38	26.32	6.00	192.00

(iii) Last migration, multiple migrants

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	239	14.14	12.85	0.00	84.00
Dm	205	14.54	15.14	0.00	122.00
Ds	138	19.93	16.40	1.00	84.00
Ml	170	19.48	12.62	2.00	72.00
Mm	529	11.38	7.15	1.00	60.00
Ms	94	19.43	18.47	1.00	120.00

Table (30) (contd.)

Total Migration period, multiple migrants (months)

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	242	38.62	23.14	0.00	132.00
Dm	207	33.12	23.03	0.00	132.00
Ds	139	44.92	28.57	5.00	156.00
Ml	171	48.32	26.95	9.00	192.00
Mm	529	36.72	17.17	7.00	156.00
Ms	94	51.85	35.43	18.00	204.00

Total Migration period (months)

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	633	32.41	27.75	0.00	156.00
Dm	681	25.85	22.65	0.00	180.00
Ds	314	33.05	27.43	2.00	156.00
Ml	557	39.92	30.93	2.00	192.00
Mm	833	28.26	18.52	1.00	156.00
Ms	301	37.87	30.71	3.00	204.00

Table (31)

Year of Return

(i) One-time Migrants

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	264	87.25	3.36	76.00	91.00
Dm	350	86.54	3.77	66.00	91.00
Ds	136	86.24	3.34	76.00	90.00
Ml	309	86.05	3.49	70.00	91.00
Mm	206	26.36	4.79	73.00	91.00
Ms	169	86.69	3.56	75.00	91.00

(ii) First migration, multiple migrants

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	239	84.99	3.67	75.00	91.00
Dm	203	84.62	3.72	75.00	91.00
Ds	139	83.82	3.29	67.00	90.00
Ml	170	83.25	4.28	72.00	90.00
Mm	529	83.71	4.55	70.00	90.00
Ms	94	83.72	4.87	71.00	91.00

(iii) Last migration, multiple migrants

	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Dl	151	88.42	2.37	81.00	91.00
Dm	145	87.71	3.07	78.00	91.00
Ds	118	87.86	2.46	80.00	91.00
Ml	113	86.97	3.25	76.00	91.00
Mm	347	88.38	3.16	74.00	91.00
Ms	57	87.32	3.07	81.00	91.00

Table (32)

Occupation Before Migration (%)

(i) One-time Migrants

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
1 Agriculture	59.02	35.03	31.43	68.91	75.99	67.15
4 Production	2.84	2.12	0.57	0.52	1.64	2.24
5 Services	5.67	7.43	7.43	4.15	2.96	1.93
6 Construction	2.58	3.40	1.71	1.55	0.66	1.45
7 Technical	2.06	3.40	1.14	1.04	0.33	1.93
9 Clerical	3.35	4.25	4.57	2.07	0.33	2.90
11 Professional	1.55	4.03	3.43	1.55	1.32	3.38
15 Unemployed	21.39	32.48	38.29	15.54	12.17	17.87

(ii) First migration, multiple migrants

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
1 Agriculture	64.14	36.76	28.06	78.82	86.01	80.85
4 Production	2.53	2.94	0.00	0.00	3.40	1.06
5 Services	4.22	4.90	6.47	2.35	2.08	0.00
6 Construction	4.22	5.88	1.44	1.76	0.57	1.06
7 Technical	1.27	4.90	1.44	0.00	0.19	0.00
9 Clerical	2.11	2.94	5.04	0.00	0.38	2.13
11 Professional	0.42	3.92	0.00	0.00	0.38	1.06
15 Unemployed	14.77	24.02	45.32	10.59	4.54	11.70

(iii) Last migration, multiple migrants

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
1 Agriculture	63.71	38.42	28.47	79.41	84.69	86.17
4 Production	2.11	2.46	0.00	0.00	3.59	1.06
5 Services	4.64	5.91	5.11	2.35	2.46	0.00
6 Construction	4.22	6.40	0.73	1.76	0.95	2.13
7 Technical	1.69	2.96	1.46	0.00	0.19	0.00
9 Clerical	4.64	7.88	9.49	1.18	0.95	3.19
11 Professional	1.27	4.93	1.46	0.59	0.38	2.13
15 Unemployed	11.81	21.18	43.80	7.65	3.78	1.06

Table (33)

Occupation During Migration (%)

(i) One-time Migrants

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
1 Agriculture	7.95	7.05	2.92	30.39	12.50	16.91
4 Production	9.49	32.48	24.56	5.19	16.45	20.29
5 Services	24.62	29.70	29.24	10.13	5.59	17.87
6 Construction	37.18	10.47	17.54	44.42	46.38	3.86
7 Technical	15.38	7.48	11.70	4.68	16.78	31.88

(ii) First migration, multiple migrants

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
1 Agriculture	0.84	3.92	7.91	15.29	7.75	21.28
4 Production	10.13	38.24	15.83	2.94	10.96	27.66
5 Services	24.89	25.49	31.65	10.59	4.73	18.09
6 Construction	44.30	13.24	17.27	64.71	60.49	1.06
7 Technical	13.08	8.82	17.99	4.71	15.31	29.79

(iii) Last migration, multiple migrants

	DI	Dm	Ds	MI	Mm	Ms
1 Agriculture	0.85	5.88	8.70	44.12	12.48	32.98
4 Production	11.02	35.29	18.12	1.18	14.74	28.72
5 Services	19.49	26.47	37.68	7.65	6.81	9.57
6 Construction	44.07	10.29	8.70	38.24	51.42	2.13
7 Technical	16.10	8.82	14.49	4.12	13.61	19.15

Table (34)

Occupation Before Migration By Occupation During Migration

(i) One-time Migrants

D

	1	4	5	6	7	All Cases
1 Agriculture	12.61	26.13	17.34	29.95	11.26	4444
5 Services	5.80	14.49	59.42	10.14	5.80	69
15 Unemployed	2.00	20.67	42.33	13.33	11.00	300
All Occupations	6.74	22.46	27.73	21.68	11.23	1024

M

	1	4	5	6	7	All Cases
1 Agriculture	27.72	14.02	8.03	35.59	12.44	635
5 Services	6.90	0.00	55.17	24.14	10.34	29
15 Unemployed	5.22	11.94	8.96	42.45	25.37	134
All Occupations	21.21	12.5	10.38	35.71	15.07	896

(ii) First migration, multiple migrants

D

	1	4	5	6	7	All Cases
1 Agriculture	4.89	22.93	12.78	40.6	13.16	266
5 Services	3.45	6.90	72.41	10.34	0.00	29
15 Unemployed	3.40	18.37	42.18	12.24	13.61	147
All Occupations	3.62	21.38	26.72	26.9	12.76	580

M

	1	4	5	6	7	All Cases
1 Agriculture	12.63	12.03	5.56	54.74	14.14	665
5 Services	0.00	0.00	46.67	53.33	0.00	15
15 Unemployed	1.89	3.77	13.21	56.60	22.64	53
All Occupations	10.97	11.22	7.57	54.35	14.75	793

Table (34) (contd.)

(iii) Last migration, multiple migrants

D

	1	4	5	6	7	All Cases
1 Agriculture	5.24	20.97	16.85	36.70	14.61	267
5 Services	3.33	13.33	73.33	6.67	0.00	30
15 Unemployed	4.58	22.90	34.35	9.92	12.21	131
All Occupations	4.34	21.35	26.22	23.78	13.19	576

M

	1	4	5	6	7	All Cases
1 Agriculture	24.85	13.55	5.12	42.62	12.35	664
5 Services	5.88	0.00	52.94	35.29	5.88	17
15 Unemployed	2.94	14.71	14.71	47.06	11.76	34
All Occupations	21.69	13.49	7.31	42.75	12.32	793

Table (35)

Occupation Before Migration By Occupation After Return, (%)

(i) One-time Migrants

D

	1	4	5	6	7	9	11	All Cases
1 Agriculture	69.46	5.36	5.83	6.76	4.90	0.70	0.23	429
15 Unemployed	8.51	6.81	28.09	9.79	7.23	22.98	11.49	235
All Occupations	36.00	6.02	17.29	8.86	6.78	11.16	6.46	914

M

	1	4	5	6	7	9	11	All Cases
1 Agriculture	77.11	4.64	3.15	6.14	2.82	0.50	0.33	603
15 Unemployed	14.88	7.44	5.79	10.74	7.44	40.50	9.92	121
All Occupations	57.38	5.43	6.38	6.97	4.25	8.15	4.01	847

(iii) Last migration, multiple migrants

D

	1	4	5	6	7	9	11	All Cases
1 Agriculture	62.36	6.84	4.56	12.17	6.47	0.00	0.00	263
15 Unemployed	6.45	8.06	16.94	5.65	9.68	34.68	7.26	124
All Occupations	32.54	8.27	13.24	11.40	8.09	11.58	3.86	544

M

	1	4	5	6	7	9	11	All Cases
1 Agriculture	71.17	5.01	2.73	14.72	2.12	0.30	0.00	659
15 Unemployed	14.89	8.51	8.51	17.02	6.38	29.79	12.77	47
All Occupations	61.62	6.16	4.62	15.28	2.18	2.70	1.28	779

Table (36)

Occupation Before First Migration By Occupation Before Last Migration (%)

multiple migrants

D

	1	9	15	All Cases
1 Agriculture	96.60	0.00	2.64	265
15 Unemployed	6.16	13.70	67.12	146
All Occupations	46.54	6.93	22.70	577

M

	1	9	15	All Cases
1 Agriculture	97.14	0.00	0.45	665
15 Unemployed	24.53	11.32	56.60	53
All Occupations	83.73	1.26	4.29	793