

Popescu Ramona Florina

University of Pitesti, Faculty of Economics, 424E, Giulesti Street, Bucharest
rf.popescu@yahoo.com 0721460607

Bondoc Maria Daniela

University of Pitesti, Faculty of Economics, 1 Targu din Vale Street, Pitesti, Romania
daniela.bondoc@upit.ro 0745770758

This article analyses the internal migration of the Romanians based on their direction, within the extent of 1990-2008. The tendencies are being examined depending on the region of origin and of destination of the migrants and also depending on their residential environment. The authors try to conduct a literature review on the subject, emphasizing the conclusions of different studies conducted during the considered period.

Key words: Internal migration, migration direction, rural migration, urban migration

JEL Codes: J01, J61

1. Introduction

The migration can be analyzed from different points of view – depending on the demographic structure of the migration (by age, gender, education), on the direction of the migration flows (internal or external destination, the nature of the destination, the occupation of the migrant at its destination), on the consequences of the phenomenon (positive or negative, economical, social or psychological effects). Among all these aspects, the article approaches only the internal migration from the standpoint of the migration destination, in Romania's case.

The proposed analysis reports on the period after 1989 and until the present and it is necessary to make a first explanation, as it results from the consulted studies: the Romanian internal migration, from the point of view of the migration's destinations, witnessed three different stages, namely: 1990 – 1996, 1997 – 2001, 2002 – 2008. [Petre, I., 2005: 1].

The stages of the Romanian internal migration could be divided further more [Sandu, D. et al., 2004: 6] from the standpoint of the migration intensity.

It is important to mark from the beginning the fact that in some studies, the authors mention that the emigration of Romanian population rises great problems regarding the valid estimation of the phenomenon dimensions because of the temporary character of the reshuffle and its associated clandestine nature. In these cases, the hypotheses were formulated based on empirical data.

2. The internal migration – amplitude and directions

Some studies [Bran, F. et al., 2001: 4] consider that between 1990 and 2001 the internal migration reached an average of 272 432 individuals each year, but with major differences between the migration flows from urban zones towards rural ones and the flows coming from rural zones towards urban ones.

Other studies [Petre, I., 2005: 1] put the average figure of the internal Romanian migrants around 300 000 persons, both for the first period taken into account (1990 – 1996) and for the second (1997 – 2001), the differences consisting only in the direction of the flows.

Thus, for the first period it was noticed the dominance of the “rural towards urban” flows, while for the second, the situation is reverse, the departures from rural zones are outstripped by the arrivals (mainly due to the retro-migration). The author [Petre, I., 2005: 1] considers that until the present, meaning for the 2002 – 2008 period, the last tendency is still valid, so that the internal migratory flows are being dominated by the “urban towards rural” and “rural towards rural” type.

The same author states that an increase of the internal migratory flow till values of approx. 375 000 persons yearly. The year 2004 is considered the year of maximum intensity of the internal migration during the analyzed period [Petre, I., 2005: 1]. The above presented tendencies are being backed up by other authors too [Ghețău, V., 2005: 74], mentioning that the urban towards rural flows remain bigger than the rural towards urban flows, despite a revival of the latest after 2000.

3. The internal regional migration

The internal migration seen from the standpoint of the migration directions among development regions [Ghețău, V., 2005: 72] was conditioned by various factors, such as:

- the economic development stage of the considered regions;
- the annual natural growth rate of the population in those regions;

Thus, analyzing the data collected during the two National Censuses (1992 and 2002) it was established [Ghețău, V., 2005: 72] that internal migration took place mostly towards the developed regions (West, Bucharest and Centre) and from the less developed ones (North-West, North-East).

The same study indicates the fact that a weaker natural growth and a lower development level lead to a strengthened migration of the North-Eastern population who went especially in West and Bucharest regions.

Evaluating the data regarding the components of the “urban towards rural” migration by the departure region, proves the fact that the migration from the urban zones towards the rural ones of the same region is much more superior to the migration from the urban zones of other regions, reality explained by the inversion of the tendency manifested during the period before 1990 when the “rural towards urban” migration was made especially towards nearby urban zones. At its turn, this tendency was motivated by the fact that it was easier to find a job, the transportation costs were lower, it was easier to find a place to stay by using personal connections – friends or relatives and it was easier to keep contact with the relatives that stayed home.

The same study [Ghețău, V., 2005: 76] analyses in detail the “urban towards rural” migration, comparing all the developing regions and draws the conclusion that among the more-developed regions (North-West, Centre and Bucharest) the intra-region migration is higher compared to the one in the case of the less-developed regions. The explanation given by the authors is that the regions with a higher level of industrialization allowed a higher absorption of the flows coming from rural regions in the period before 1990 and the reversion of the flows after the 1990s led to a greater share of internal migrants from urban regions towards rural ones. Among the migrants from other regions, it seems that most of them came from the neighboring regions.

Considering the inter-regional migration from the point of view of the region of destination, it can be noticed [Ghețău, V., 2005: 77] that for the less-developed regions (North-East and the three regions from the south) the departures from urban zones had as main destination the rural localities of the same region, due to the fact that the cities of the same regions did not allow their absorption and because in the past the urban zones of those regions had attracted migrants from the same region. For the other regions this tendency is much smaller, the explanations depending on the characteristics of Bucharest region which imposed an “inversed” migration mostly towards the South and North-East regions (the last one being more remote but also poorer), on the attraction manifested in the past by the regions West and Centre for the inhabitants of North-East and South-West regions, whose inhabitants are now returning home.

As a tendency, the departures from rural zones (towards urban or rural zones) are constantly decreasing during the analyzed period [Petre, I., 2005: 2]. Regarding the urban towards rural flows among historical regions, the less attractive regions are Oltenia and Moldavia [Petre, I., 2005: 3], [Sandu, D., 1999: 177], and the most attractive are the departments from Banat and the

Romanian Plain [Sandu, D., 1999: 178], this last case proving to be an exception from the rule that the destination is always more developed than the origin.

4. Internal migration between residence environments

The internal migration between the residence environment (rural / urban) after the 1990s knew a “balancing” evolution, meaning that the tendencies observed before that moment, are now reversed. As a consequence, until 1997 when the urban towards rural migration became dominant, there could be defined another three significant moments [Rotariu, T., Mezei, E., 1999: 15], such as:

- year 1994, when the rural towards urban flows recorded a peak;
- year 1995, when rural towards rural migration became dominant;
- year 1996, with a peak for the urban towards urban migration.

leading to the conclusion that the migration flows tend to rebalance each other.

The explanation for internal migration tendencies between different residence environments is that:

- the economic restructuring shock experienced after the year 1989, materialized in the loss of jobs from urban sites [Sandu, D., 1999: 179] [Ghețău, V., 2005 : 73]. Therefore, the great majority of those who are returning to the villages are the ones who couldn't survive in towns in the new conditions imposed by the transition, while only a small part of the retro-migrants have enough financial resources to begin rural economic projects or to live in closer-to-nature conditions. Rural places attracting the latter ones are situated nearby big cities, with strong economies or nearby places with touristic potential. [Petre, I., 2005: 3]
- the tendency to suppress the plying [Sandu, D., 1999: 180], [Rotariu, T., Mezei, E., 1999: 14] and
- the lack of urban tenements as a consequence of the fact that the construction of new apartment blocks was ceased [Rotariu, T., Mezei, E., 1999: 16].
- the tendency to return to the initial residence (retro-migration), mostly around the pension age [Sandu, D., 1999: 178], [Petre, I., 2005: 3].
- the new land law regarding the land retrocession made after the co-operative farms and other similar structures were suppressed [Ghețău, V., 2005: 75]
- the civil status and the age of the subjects, the analysis indicating that the married with children adults hardly beard the shock of changes [Ghețău, V., 2005: 75].

Excepting the internal migration between different residence environments, there also are migration flows between environments of the same type, rural towards rural and urban towards urban. In this case, studies [Bran, F. et all., 2001: 8] reflect that:

- the migration movement from rural towards rural recorded a peak in 1995 (7.8‰), than it decreased (to 4.7‰) reaching in 2000 a value of 5.5‰; in 2002 the value increased to 6.8‰.
- the urban towards urban flows has an increasing evolution until 1996 (6.5‰) than they recorded a minor decrease (to 4.7‰ in 2000); the biggest value was recorded in 2002 (6.8‰).

5. Conclusions

Other studies prove that:

- migration towards rural sites is realized mostly inside the same department [Rotariu, T., Mezei, E., 1999: 21];
- more than one half of Bucharest inhabitants prefer the rural destinations in other towns detriment [Rotariu, T., Mezei, E., 1999: 30];
- there are major differences between the departments both from the point of view of the preferred destination (urban or rural) and those of the departing environment (urban or rural) [Rotariu, T., Mezei, E., 1999: 31];

- less than one third of Romania's population changed its domicile at least once in their life, but the number is decreasing, and the migration distance as a consequence of the domicile changing is relatively reduced (approximately 48% of the migrants did not pass the department's borders) [Constantin, D.-L. et al., 2004: 35];

- approximately 6.7 billion persons migrated at least once in their lifetime, inside the country [Constantin, D.-L. et al., 2004: 35];

- the positive rural migration balances are due to adults (over 35 years) and aged persons, whose input flows are significantly bigger and exceed the negative balances recorded for young people [Petre, I., 2005: 3].

It is obvious that all those remarks are not entirely relevant unless they are set in the larger context of the general migration of Romanians, in other words only if it is considered the external migration, too. The remarks can be astonishing, meaning that the ancient urban towards rural migrants might have become the nowadays external migrants, as well as it can be noted that different regions „export” their inhabitants towards different areas, depending on a variety of factors (from social to religious ones).

Taking into account the above, our study is followed by another one regarding the external migration

Acknowledgements: This article is the result of the research conducted during the project "Model funcțional de estimare a dimensiunii forței de muncă real disponibile în mediul rural" (DALFI) (Functional model for the estimation of the really available manpower in rural areas), PNCDI, CAPACITATI - II, Contract No. 200 / September 2008

BIBLIOGRAFIE

1. Bran, F., Lilea, E., Tițan, E., Vățui, M., Rădulescu, C.V., Ioan, I., Raport de cercetare - grant – Sistem metodologic de evaluare a impactului globalizării asupra migrației, 2001

2. Ghețău, V., Migrations et incidence sur la repartition spatiale de la population en Roumanie au niveau national et regional, The Romanian Journal of European Studies, No.4, The West University Publishing House, 2005

3. Petre, I., Internal migration and the Romanian village, 2005, <http://strategia.ncsd.ro/>

4. Rotaru, T., Mezei, E., Asupra unor aspecte ale migrației interne recente din Romania, Romanian Sociology, nr. III, 1999

5. Sandu, D., Dezvoltare comunitară. Cercetare, practică, ideologie, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2005

6. Sandu, D., Radu, C., Constantinescu, M., Ciobanu, O., *A Country Report on Romanian Migration Abroad: Stocks and Flows afer 1989*, Multicultural Center Prague, 2004, www.migrationonline.cz

7. Sandu, D., *The social space of transition*, Polirom Publishing House, 1999