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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a result of research undertaken in Kasama District of the Northern Province of Zambia from January to March 1988. Data were collected from 130 households and thirteen village industry entrepreneurs from four villages in the district. The study sought to investigate the effect of rural-urban migration on the development of village industries and conversely to evaluate and analyse the impact of village industries on rural-urban migration.

In this study the impact of the rural-urban migration was analysed with reference to its impact on rural labour supply for village industry and potential village industry entrepreneurs. Interest was in finding out whether rural-urban migration deprives the rural areas of potential employees and village industry entrepreneurs. The study also attempted to investigate whether migration reduces rural household incomes which may result in the contraction of the market for the products of village industries. Finally the study analysed the impact of those who return to the village from urban areas with new ideas, skills and capital on the development of village industries.

The impact of village industries on migration was analysed with reference to their impact in reducing rural-urban migration, encouraging the return of migrants from urban to rural areas, creation of jobs and sources of income and the improvement of living conditions of the rural population.
It was found that far from impoverishing the rural areas, migration serves the rural areas in many ways. Firstly, it reduces unemployment in the countryside. Secondly, migration provides the village with working capital for farming and non-farm enterprises such as village industries. Thirdly, and perhaps more important, some migrants acquire skills and ideas and a receptivity to new ideas and innovation which have been instrumental in the development of the few village industries that exist.

With respect to the effect of village industries on reducing the movement to towns, the findings suggest that the impact is marginal. This is probably because the number of enterprises is low, their range of products narrow and their scale of operation is too small to have any significant impact on creating employment and viable sources of incomes, or improving the rural living conditions. Hence rural poverty persists and urban-bound migration continues in search of economic betterment. The findings also suggest that existing industries have serious problems such as transport, lack of raw materials and limited market due to low population concentrations and low purchasing power. Existing or potential village industries are not and will not be able to overcome these difficulties without specific government investment in transport and raw material development. A whole package of appropriate policies is also needed to raise rural incomes and living conditions so that rural needs can be translated into effective demand.
Several policy implications emerge from the findings of this study. First, policy makers must not halt the movement to towns as that would only worsen rural poverty and unemployment. Secondly, as long as inequalities in social services, incomes and jobs between rural and urban areas exist and as long as school curricula continue to be urban oriented rural-urban migration particularly amongst the educated members should be expected to continue. Thirdly, policy makers must bear in mind that the reduction of rural unemployment and the raising of living conditions are not likely to be achieved through village industries per se. Rather it is only through a whole package of policies in which employment opportunities in other rural occupations and economic infrastructure will be developed simultaneously to boost other rural occupations and subsequently raise rural incomes. It is only within this broader environment of circumstances and influences that village industries can thrive and contribute effectively to improving living conditions and subsequently to a reduction in the movement to towns. Finally, if village industries are to be effectively integrated into rural development planning, more empirical research needs to be done in many areas including the kind of goods urgently needed in rural areas, the raw material situation and market potential. Such data should provide an improved planning framework for organisations and individuals interested in promoting village industries.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to investigate the inter-relationship between rural-urban migration and village industries.

The importance of studying such a relationship stems from the simplistic view held by policy makers and researchers alike concerning the effect of rural-urban migration on the rural economy, which in turn has led to the adoption of simplistic policies designed to contain the flow.

Research on rural-urban migration has portrayed migration as one of the major causes of rural underdevelopment, particularly agricultural development. Byerlee (1974: 543) for example, points out that out-migration from agriculture has been one factor leading to national food deficits and rising costs in many African countries. The Zambian Government has expressed a similar concern over what it perceives to be the negative effects of migration on agricultural development (Chilivumbo, 1980). For these reasons, there is now the wide spread concern that rates of rural-urban migration should be slowed down. For example, in early 1988 President Kaunda reiterated the need for the constitution to be amended to facilitate the reversal of this trend (Chibesa, in Times of Zambia, 3 August 1988).

1. These are also known by a variety of terms and notions cottage industry, household industry, rural industry, rural small scale industry etc. They all fit into the pattern or form a part of what is called "small-scale industry" (Schadler [1968:8]).
Despite considerable research on rural-urban migration in Zambia, there is an inadequate understanding of its implications for rural socio-economic development. While research has tended to focus on the negative aspects of rural-urban migration in rural areas, it is the aim of this paper to demonstrate that rather than being viewed as an overriding constraint, rural-urban migration should be viewed as a positive and instrumental force in the rural development process. This will be demonstrated with particular reference to village industries.

Apart from helping to demonstrate the beneficial impact of rural-urban migration, the choice of village industries for study helps to fill the gap in migration literature which has tended to focus on the effects of migration on agriculture. There is need for research into the impact of rural-urban migration on various aspects of the rural economy (Essang and Mabawoku, 1974; Chanda, 1985). The choice of village industries for study has also been prompted by the fact that they are now the principal means identified by policy makers to stem the rural-urban influx.

It is against this background that the present study seeks to analyse the effect of rural-urban migration on the current efforts being made towards village industrialisation. Meanwhile the government’s efforts to reverse the trend of rural-urban migration is traced to as far back as 1975, when the state sought to establish Rural Reconstruction Centres (RRC’s) in the remote areas of the country.
These were set up in the hope that they would provide facilities for employment which would in turn reduce the rural-urban influx. Today Zambia is on a threshold of a new era as it seeks to halt this trend by encouraging the development of village industries identified (in passing) as the solution to the problem of rural-urban migration. There is now the general view that village industries will be able to generate employment, raise incomes and living conditions of the rural population, subsequently leading to a decline in the rates of rural-urban migration. This is implicitly stated in the Village Industry Pamphlet, and the Zambia Daily Mail of 10, 19 and 24 August, 1987. To achieve these goals the government has formed a number of support organisations which include the Village Industry Service (VIS) in 1976, and the Small Industry Development Organisation (SIDO) in 1981. SIDO is a government organisation (Parastatal) while VIS is a non-governmental organisation. Another non-governmental organisation is the Small Scale Enterprise Promotion Limited (SEP) which was established in 1983. All the above support institutions are concerned with fostering small-scale industries.

Literature on small-scale industries is now extensive. According to available literature, the rural small-scale industries sector is extensive both in terms of number of establishments and employment (Milimo and Fisheha, 1985; Milimo, 1987). Writing about the small-scale industrial sector in the Northern Province in which this study was undertaken, Milimo (1987) notes that this is a very important sector in the economy of the province.
He goes on to point out that it provides unavailable goods and services, and generates employment which is otherwise difficult to come by especially when the national economy is not doing so well.

Against this general impression portrayed by the literature on the magnitude of the rural small-scale industrial sector, this study will also investigate the extent to which village industries have helped to achieve the government's goals of: Providing wage employment to the rural population; raising rural incomes and living conditions and reducing rural-urban migration as well as encouraging the return of migrants to rural areas.

It is the contention of this study that the mere introduction of village industries is not sufficient to stem the rural-urban influx unless the programme is accompanied by broader policies in favour of rural areas.

For a proper assessment of the impact village industries have on the goals envisaged by the government, it was necessary and initially planned to compare a set of villages with "many village industries" to those with fewer or no village industries. However, villages with "many village industries" were non-existent. The impression given that there are many small industries in the rural areas (villages) of Zambia belongs to the hypothetical world of the academician and armchair policy makers. In addition, as Milimo (1987) has pointed out, the small-scale enterprises in the Northern Province are really small affairs, the majority of them employing only one person.
Given the problem of finding villages with village industries worth studying, this study covered four villages which apart from having one or two village industries, also had village industries funded either by VIS or the Village Development Foundation (VDF).

It was felt that in the absence of village industries worth studying, the institutionally funded projects could provide some terms of reference in relation to the goals envisaged by the government in addition to highlighting some of the approaches, their merits and limitations, that the institutions have adopted.

By documenting the complex relationship between the process of migration and village industries, this study provides a richer, more comprehensive interpretation of the two phenomena, providing alternative thinking to the simplistic view held by policy makers and researchers alike. It is the view of the author that the findings are reasonably reliable to make an evaluation of the effect of rural-urban migration on village industries and vice versa, as well as assess the impact and implications of the two phenomena for rural socio-economic development, not only in Kasama District, but also the Northern Province as a whole.

This study is based on field research undertaken between January 25 and March 25, 1988 in Kasama District. The four villages covered by the study were Chitimukulu, Mumba, Nseluka and Kanyata.
The rest of this paper is arranged as follows:

Chapter two is a review of the literature with the view of giving the conceptual framework of the study.

The third introduces the study area with the view to identify the villages covered.

The fourth deals with the objectives, hypothesis, methods of the survey and reliability of the information collected. Definitions of terms used in this and subsequent chapters are included in this chapter.

The fifth deals with the effect of rural-urban migration on the development of village industries.

The sixth looks at the effect of village industries on rural-urban migration and the return of migrants to rural areas.

The seventh draws together a summary and interpretation of the main findings.
CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTUAL JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

This chapter provides the justification of the study, firstly within the context of the past studies on migration and, secondly, within the context of the past studies on small-scale industries. The latter is also important because it gives a background to the current emphasis on small-scale industries not only in Zambia but in other African countries as well (ILO Report III, 1973:21).

2.1 Theoretical framework of migration studies

Migration, that is the movement of individuals and groups from one place to another has been taking place since the origin of man (Hammond, 1979; Kubinda, 1982). Whereas earlier migrations had been permanent movements of colonisations, modern migrations are periodic migrations of labour, not people (Amin, 1974). Hence the following account is not so much a bibliographic survey, but an attempt to note some of the basic themes in the literature on African labour migrations, only some of which are the work of Geographers (Swindell, 1979). Despite the extensive literature on migration, the underlying causes and effects have not been fully understood and are subject to much dispute (Swindell, 1979; Lewis, 1982; Kubat, 1976; Kubinda, 1982). For example, some of the disputes on the causes have centered on the following questions: Are workers "pushed" or "pulled" and should they be viewed as active decision-makers or as passive elements manipulated by global forces? (Swindell, 1979:239). This lack of
unanimity in migration literature is due to a number of reasons which include lack of coherent theory and agreed methodology of data collection and analysis, difficulty and inconsistency in defining migration as well as limited census data (Lewis, 1982; Swindell, 1979; Amin, 1974; Kubat, 1976; Essang and Mabwuko, 1974; Kosinki and Prothero, 1975; Kubinda, 1982). Because of their lack of coherence and consistency of methodology, migration studies have been accused of being fragmentary, without orientation and theoretically sterile (Swindell, 1979: 242).

Beneath this disorder and apparent chaos, however, three broad themes are recognizable. These have centred on the following questions.

1. Why do people migrate?

2. What are the spatial patterns of the migration process?

3. What are the consequences of migration on the place or origin, destination and migrants themselves?

The first theme, why people migrate, has extensive literature (Simmons, et al. 1984: 12). The literature abounds in empirical descriptions, conceptual frameworks, typologies, models (Economic, Gravity, "Push" and "Pull", Behavioral, Ecological and Aggregate), to explain why people migrate. Although there has been much dispute amongst these different schools of thought on the exact cause of migration, the evidence is overwhelming in suggesting that the basic motivation is economic - the search for employment and security (Simmons, et al. 1984: 12; Gugler, 1969: 137).
Spatial patterns of labour migration (theme 2) can be classified into two main groups, namely: international migrations and internal migrations. International migrations in Africa had more significance in the pre-independence era of the late fifties when movements of workers to towns, mines, cash-crop regions were encouraged by colonial regimes. With the coming of independence in most African states, the flow of international migrants has declined because of nationalism and the decline in local opportunities for employment which in some countries has led to repatriation of foreign nationals (Swindell, 1979; Parkin, 1972). Hence the focus of modern migration studies including this one is on internal migrations.

Internal migrations refer to intra-state movements and comprise four movements. These are rural-urban and rural-rural, urban-rural and urban-urban migrations. Of these, four movements, only rural-urban (see Caldwell, 1969; Mwanza, 1979 and Gregory, 1974) and to a limited extent rural-rural (see Kubinda 1982; Kosinski and Prothero, 1975) have received attention. Rural-urban studies have focussed mainly on causes, magnitude, origin-destination, characteristics of migrant (age, sex, education etc) and the impact of rural-urban migration on urban employment and living conditions.

The impact of migration (theme 3) can be analysed at three levels, namely: The society, community of origin and destination, and the individuals themselves. This is summarised in Table 2.1 below.
Table 2.1. A simplified framework for the study of consequences of migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Studies on the consequences of migration have tended to focus on different aspects. For example, some studies focus on the social aspects while others focus on either the economic or the demographic aspect. In addition studies have tended to adopt different levels of analysis. For example, some studies have focussed on the consequences of migration on individuals while others, have focussed on the community and still others on the society. Consequently findings have been diverse and sometimes contradictory. This, as indicated earlier in the chapter, has resulted in much controversy and little understanding of the actual impact of migration (Lewis, 1982; Kubinda, 1982; Chanda, 1985). For example, some writers argue that rural-urban migration facilitates the economic development of a country through an efficient allocation of labour over regions (Caldwell, 1969). Others focus on the rural economy, arguing that rural-urban migration is detrimental to rural development because it robs the countryside of the most able members needed to spearhead
agricultural and other rural development projects (Richardson, 1953; Byerlee, et al., 1976; ILO/JASPA Basic Needs Mission to Zambia 1981). Others focus on return-migrants arguing that rural-urban migration contributes to rural development because those who return are more cosmopolitan and subsequently initiators and leaders in various rural development projects (Phipps, 1973; Chilivumbo, 1980; Byerlee, et al., 1976; Chanda, 1985). Byerlee et al., (1976), for example, found that about four times as many urban-rural migrants engaged in non-farm occupations as did non-migrants. In response some writers argue that return-migrants are often poorly educated, and often return because of economic hardships in urban areas or old age. Consequently they contribute little to the development of their areas (Byerlee et al., 1976).

Another conflict in empirical studies has centred on remittances, that is, the flow of cash and goods from urban migrants to rural areas. On one hand some scholars have argued that remittances are sizeable and provide the much needed capital for various rural development projects including farms, new housing and non-farm enterprises (Caldwell, 1969; Long; 1969; Chanda, 1985). Long (1969), for example, describes the use of remittances to establish farms, purchase implements and seeds, hire labour or build up non-agricultural enterprises in the Serenje District of Zambia. Chanda (1985) also concluded from his study in the Samfya area of Zambia that remittances help to reduce poverty and induce commercial resource exploitation (farming, fishing and other commercial
ventures). In response some writers such as Rempel and Lobdell (1979) in a study that was worldwide but relied primarily on African data, point out that, in most cases, where rural areas receive substantial remittances it seems very little is used directly as investment for rural development. They conclude that factors such as paying debts, providing school for relatives, and purchasing consumption goods take up between 80 and 90 percent of rural remittances.

This brief survey of migration studies suggests that there is need for more policy oriented research to establish the exact consequences of migration. Studies on the consequences of rural-urban migration have mainly focussed on the impact in urban areas at the expense of the rural end of the spatial continuum (Chanda, 1985; Simmons, et, al. 1984). There is need for research into the impact of rural-urban migration on various aspects of the rural economy (Essang and Mabawoku, 1974; Chanda, 1985). At the same time less attention has been given to migration within the rural sectors (Simmons, et al., 1984) as well as urban-rural or return migration (King, 1978; King and Stranchan, 1980). As Byerlee (1972) points out, probably many young migrants who fail to obtain a city job return home, but the significance of this flow needs to be researched.

Another weakness of most migration studies is that research on migration has been conducted as an end in itself. Such studies have tended to treat migration as an isolated phenomenon rather than as
one variable among many interacting in the process of economic development (Simmons, et al., 1984; Essang and Mabawoku, 1974). In particular insufficient attention has been given to the impact of major programmes designed to influence migration. As Simmons, et al., (1984: 12) point out, whenever an opportunity emerges, we must also take advantage to study government programmes designed to influence migration.

This study is thus an attempt to contribute towards these gaps in literature, namely the impact of rural-urban migration on various aspects of the rural economy, village industries in this particular case. This study will also contribute some knowledge to the neglected aspect of urban-rural or return migration and its significance to the rural economy, specifically on the development of village industries. Finally, the study integrates migration research into policy relating to economic development by analysing the impact of a major government programme (promotion of rural small-scale industries, see chapter 1) which has been designed to indirectly influence migration.

2.2 Theoretical framework for industries studies

Recent years have witnessed an increase in literature on small-scale industries in Africa. This has been prompted in part by the failure of past urban-based large-scale industrialisation strategies (Nyirongo, 1984; Liedholm and Chuta, 1975). This latter strategy has failed to absorb idle internal labour and raw material resources.
It has also failed to generate the expected economic development as well as redressing imbalances not only in urban areas but also between urban and rural areas (Gregory, 1974).

There has also been a growing recognition that small-scale industrial establishments are not just an urban phenomenon, but also an important component of rural development (Liedholm, 1973). This idea of rural small-scale industries was implicitly advocated by Schumacher (1975) who developed the idea of "intermediate technology" which as Mallinkrodt-Neidhardt (1986) puts it, was to earn him global recognition.

Schumacher argued that the western kind of development adopted by Third World countries only benefitted a small western elite. He pointed out that people flee from rural areas into towns worsening poverty in the home area. The solution, he said, is to provide employment for the impoverished masses not living in the industrial sectors of our dual economies. Any work no matter how lowly paid is better than nothing in Schumacher's view. Of course, such jobs must be cheap to create. They must meet the basic needs of the people and must suit the regional and local conditions. Production techniques used must be relatively simple, mainly local materials must be used and production must be on the spot (Schumacher, 1975).

Schumacher's ideas soon became the philosophy adopted by many volunteer organisations and national governments in the 1960's and 1970's (Mallinkrodt-Neidhardt, 1986).
As a result the promotion of rural industries is beginning to feature in many African national development plans (ILO, 1973). It is these developments which have provided a stimulus to the current literature on small-scale industries.

Although there have been surveys of small-scale industries in a number of African countries, only a few have included firms in the rural areas (Liedholm, 1973). Moreover, most of the surveys that have been done in rural areas have tended to focus on activities in larger rural areas (Liedholm, 1973).

The few studies done in rural areas particularly by Liedholm (1973) and Liedholm and Chuta (1975) in West Africa, provide much insight into this sector. Amongst the findings is that there is a surprising diversity of activities in the rural industrial sector most of which involve production or provision of goods and services for local markets. The findings show that tailoring is the most extensive followed by carpentry. There is also a small amount of rural activity centred around locally produced cereals and vegetable extraction (Liedholm, 1973). These latter studies show that, entrepreneurs tend to be younger and more educated, while the size of establishments tend to be small, having an average of 2.6 workers.
In Zambia, literature on small-scale industries portrays shortcomings similar to those outlined by Liedholm (1973). For example, most studies have focused on small-scale industries in urban areas. Such urban studies have tended to focus on various activities taking place and their magnitude, providing definitions of small-scale industry, outlining bureaucratic, legal and financial constraints, and, perhaps more important, describing the potential role that this sector can play in employment generation and national development (see Hansen, 1982; Todd, 1980; Hoppers, 1982; Mulala, 1984; Nchube, 1982; Nyirongo, 1984). Very few studies have included firms in rural areas. The most notable ones include a nation-wide survey by Milimo and Fisseha in 1985, two separate studies by Milimo (1987) in the Northern Province of Zambia, and a small-scale industry social survey in the Luapula Province by Chilivumbo et al. (1988). These few studies that have been done in rural areas have taken place either in large district centres or a combination of both district centres and small rural trading centres. For example, an inventory of small-scale enterprises in the Northern Province by Milimo (1987) contains a list of addresses of small-scale industries such as bakeries and carpentry workshops in the major district centres, while the Luapula survey by Chilivumbo and others (1986) covered not only rural town centres but also chiefs' areas and other large rural settlements. There is thus a need not only for research to cover the remote and smaller villages, but also to disaggregate and point out
the variations which exists in the magnitude and nature of enterprises in rural town centres and outlying areas. This kind of information would enable policy makers and various concerned organisations to identify which industries are suitable or needed in different areas and which ones may merit assistance of what kinds and towards which goals (see section 6.1).

The few studies done in rural areas particularly the ones by Milimo and Fisseha (1985) and Milimo (1987) show that small-scale industries are quite extensive both in terms of number of establishments and amount of employment generated. The findings further show that beer brewing is the most extensive followed by carpentry, vending, tailoring and knitting (Milimo and Fisseha, 1985). In terms of size of establishments, the findings show that the majority are tiny one-man operations, with an average labour force of about 1.6 at national level and 1.42 in the Northern Province (Milimo and Fisseha, 1985; Milimo 1987; Chilivumbo et al., 1988). As for the characteristics of entrepreneurs, the results of the Northern Province survey by Milimo (1987) show that about nine percent of the entrepreneurs are aged 20 years and less, and that most of them have received some formal education (Milimo, 1987: 11-13).
While the few studies done in rural areas provide an insight into the rural small-scale industrial sector, there still remains an urgent need for more policy-oriented research to evaluate the strength of this sector in relation to the type of productive structure envisaged in the future especially with respect to the needs of the rural population. For example, how appropriate are the goods produced or sold to the needs of the rural population? To what extent can potential rural-small industries help to reduce the problem of unemployment and underemployment in the countryside? To what extent have these small industries helped to reduce the influx into urban areas, or raise rural incomes and living conditions? There is also need for research to ascertain the extent to which these industries fit in the local environment, use local materials and stimulate linkages with agriculture and other industries in both rural and urban areas.

As the government pursues its current policy aimed at encouraging rural based small industries, it will need quantitative information on the performance of various industries in relation to the goals envisaged for the future (see chapter 1, and chapter 6). Information is required by policy makers to judge whether the kind of industries and instruments to promote them are effective or if other means should be used (ILO/JASPA Basic needs Mission to Zambia, 1981: 167). At the moment, however, such kind of data sets are not available.
This study will be able to generate some of the required data in relation to some of the questions raised in the preceding paragraph, and thus will be fulfilling a clearly articulated need of the government policy makers and planners.
CHAPTER 3

THE STUDY AREAS

This chapter introduces the villages in which the field study was done. The chapter first outlines some salient features of Kasama, the district in which the villages are located. This is necessary in order for certain features in the study areas as well as the discussion of the findings and policy implications (chapter 7) to be understood within a broader context of the social and economic conditions prevailing in the district as a whole.

3.1 Kasama District: General Profile

Kasama District occupies a peripheral location on the plateau near the border of Zambia with Tanzania. It lies between longitudes 30-33° E, and latitudes 9-11° S (see map 1).

The district has an area 20 550 square kilometres, making it the second largest district in the province after Mpika. Administratively it is the headquarters of the Northern Province.

A large part of Kasama District is a highland plateau, over 1200 metres above mean sea level. It lies in the high rainfall belt of the country receiving between 1000 and 1600 mm of rain per annum.
Temperatures in the area are moderate, ranging from 10-30 degrees Celsius with an annual mean of 15.4 degrees, making the district suitable for a wide variety of crops (Luchichad, Zambia Daily Mail, 10 February, 1989).

The soils of the district are not very fertile because of the high rainfall and acidity, but the rest of the Northern Province in Zambia has high fertility soils. Besides, however, respond well to fertilizers, and in recent years have been achieving high yields of up to 14.4 metric tons per hectare of maize. Farmers have been achieving excellent yields of up to 19 metric tons per hectare of maize. Under reduced rainfall conditions, however, the soils are less fertile, and yields are lower. For example, at Misanfu Research Station in Zambia in 1977, an average of 1.5 metric tons per hectare of maize was produced. The population of the district was estimated at 172,595 in 1985 (C.S.O., 1986: 2) and projected to 199,375 in 1988 (C.S.O., 1987: 3). The 1985 figure represents an increment of approximately 17 percent over a period of five years from 147,594 in 1980 (see Table 3.1), while the 1988 figure represents an increase of approximately 10 percent over a period.
Temperatures in the area are moderate, ranging from 10-30 degrees celsius with an annual mean of 15.4 degrees, making the district suitable for a wide variety of crops (Uprichard, Zambia Daily Mail, 17 February, 1989).

The soils of the district are not very fertile. Like the rest of the Northern Province in general, the soils are leached and acidic because of the high rainfall (Bratton, 1980: 43; Department of Agriculture Annual Report, 1985: 2; Mackel, 1971). The soils, however, respond well to fertilisers, and are then potentially very productive. For example, at Misamfu Research Station in Kasama, yields of up to 10 tons per hectare of maize have been achieved on trials (Uprichard, Zambia Daily Mail, 17 February, 1989). Under prolonged use, however, they rapidly lose their chemical fertility as nutrients are either leached or lost to the harvest. The reliance on chemical fertilisers combined with the recent increases in the price of fertilisers makes commercial farming a costly venture for the small-scale farmers, forcing the majority of them into more subsistence forms.

The population of the district was estimated at 172,595 in 1985 (C.S.O, 1986: 2) and projected to 190,235 in 1988 (C.S.O, 1987: 3). The 1985 figure represents an increment of approximately 17 percent over a period of five years from 147,594 in 1980 (see Table 3.1), while the 1988 figure represents an increase of approximately 10 percent over a period
of three years from 1985. This is a marked improvement over the 1963-69 period when the district experienced a negative population growth due to out-migration to the Copperbelt and the main urban centre, Lusaka. This reversal in the trends of population growth is largely a result of the decline in the rates of rural-urban migration (see chapter 5, section 5.1). The district is densely populated with an average of approximately 9 persons per square kilometre (using 1985 population estimates from Table 3.1) when compared to the provincial average of 4.6 persons, and the national average of 7.5 (C.S.O, 1985: 8-9).

The overall mean figures (population density) given in the preceding paragraph hide much variation in distribution of population in Kasama District. With the exception of the Chambeshi floodplain area where the population density is about 25 people per square kilometre, much of the plateau area is sparsely populated with an average of 2-3 people per square kilometre (Uprichard, Zambia Daily Mail, 17 February, 1989). The low population density over the plateau area is due to the fact that the majority of settlements are small and widely dispersed. Bratton (1980: 41) for example, estimates that ninety-two percent of the 103,000 people in Kasama District in 1974 lived in these small and scattered communities containing about 40 to 80 people, or about fifteen to twenty houses. He goes on to point out that, there were about 500 such villages compared with only 71 villages with 200 or more residents.
Bratton (1980: 46) quotes the Kasama District notebook which states that, in earlier times villages in Kasama District were generally much larger and far more concentrated. The reduction and dispersion of village populations has been attributed to the interaction of various factors such as labour migration, the establishment of individual farmsteads, and the dwindling of traditional authority (Bratton, 1980: 46).

While the small and scattered village communities may be conducive to the extensive and shifting agricultural system prevalent in the district, (see paragraph 8 below) the thinly dispersed population makes the provision of social services both difficult and costly. In addition, small population concentrations along with the low per capita purchasing power characteristic of most rural areas (ILO/JASPA Basic needs Mission to Zambia, 1981: xxvi) are likely to limit revenue from retail trading as well as other commercial ventures such as rural industries. This is because a smaller village means fewer people to spend money on goods and services?

Agriculture is the main economic activity of the population. The majority of farmers are subsistence farmers (Department of Agriculture Annual Report, 1985: 1). Peasants in Kasama have traditionally practised Chitemene cultivation. This is a shifting form of cultivation whereby crops such as finger-millet, cassava, groundnuts, beans and maize are cultivated in an ash circle created by the burning of lopped tree branches.
Peasant farmers resort to this method of farming, among other reasons, to neutralise the acidity of the soil which is characteristic of this region as earlier indicated. The heat from the burning fire also helps to kill weed seeds and reduce pests and diseases. The ashes from the burnt trees helps to improve the fertility of the soil. However, due to the decline in good woodland areas, government policy, and development programmes like the Village Agricultural Programme (VAP) and the Intergrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), a more permanent system of cultivation is gaining a significant headway in the province as a whole (SATEP, ILO report 1985: 7; Bratton, 1980: 43; Uprichard, Zambia Daily Mail, 17 February, 1989). One indicator which shows this trend is the increased hectarage and impressive increase in crop production (maize, coffee, rice, cotton and sunflower) (Department of Agriculture Annual Report, 1985:1; SATEP, ILO report, 1985:7). In 1988 for example, Northern Province produced 1.6 million bags of maize compared to 932,976 in 1987 and 682,366 in 1986 (Times of Zambia, 28 February 1989).

Apart from crop cultivation, farmers in the district keep small herds of cattle as an additional source of income. Cattle farming is concentrated in the area along the Chambeshi plains (see map 2). A state ranch (Mbesuma) is located in this area.
Map 2: LOCATION OF STUDY AREAS IN KASAMA DISTRICT

Adapted with modifications from Bratton M, (1980); LOCAL POLITICS OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT: PEASANT AND PARTY STATE IN ZAMBIA, USA University Press of New England
Dairy farming in the district is negligible. Very few farmers are involved in dairy farming. The bulk of milk consumed in the district is produced by Kasama Rural Dairy and marketed by the Dairy Produce Board (Department of Agriculture Annual Report, 1985: 37). With the establishment of a dairy demonstration farm in Kasama under Irish Aid, perhaps more farmers in the district will take up dairy farming.

Fishing is another supplementary activity. Fishing is concentrated in the Chambeshi area. Most of the fish caught from this area is sold fresh or dried in Kasama town.

In terms of accessibility, Kasama District is well linked to Zambia’s line of rail urban centres by the main tarred road running from Kapiri Mposhi and branching at Mpika to Mbulungu port on Lake Tanganyika and Nakonde on the border between Zambia and Tanzania (see map 1). There is also an all-weather road linking Kasama to Mansa in the Luapula Province. Mansa is in turn linked to the Copperbelt via the pedicle or the Chinese built Serenje-Samfya-Mansa road. In addition to road links, there is also the Chinese built Tanzania-Zambia railway (TAZARA) which was routed through the district on its course between Kapiri Mposhi and Dar-es-Salaam in Tanzania. There is also an airport and a television and telephone microwave station in Kasama town. Kasama has thus experienced a dramatic improvement in communication in the post independence era in contrast to the
pre-independence era when Audrey Richards (1986) (cited by Bratton, 1980: 41) remarked that the Bemba country is remote and without transport and might be considered one of the toughest proposition an administrator has to deal with from an economic point of view.

While Kasama District is well linked to the urban centres, geographic isolation remains characteristic of most of the outlying scattered villages referred to earlier in the chapter. While the feeder road system is generally good, the vast distances to be covered and the absence of public transport makes transport one of the biggest and most urgent problems that policy makers have to deal with in their rural development effort. With the exception of a few people in villages lying along the major roads the majority of people in other villages including those in one of the study areas, Chitimukulu, have to walk long distances before they can find transport to take them to the district centre to buy some of their basic goods - mealie meal, soap, cooking oil, paraffin, matches and candles, which are often not available in the villages. In addition, when transport is available it is often very expensive for the average village incomes. One of the study areas, Mumba, is a typical example of a village where transport is very expensive, presumably because of the long distance from the district centre
as well as the comparatively high incomes from rice growing and fishing which make the private transporters to believe that people can easily afford to pay the high fares.

The degree to which the transport situation has deteriorated recently in the district and the province as a whole can be illustrated by the examples of the United Bus Company (UBZ) and the NCU.

At the time of the field survey by this researcher, the UBZ branch in Kasama, which in the past used to operate bus services within and between the districts, did not have a single bus which was running. The NCU which is responsible for the delivery of farm inputs, collection of farm produce from rural depots in the province had in February 1989, only 35 vehicles out of the required 150 (Uprichard, Zambia Daily Mail, 17 February, 1989). This has in turn resulted in the inevitable and persistent consequence of many bags of agricultural produce being soaked, lack of or late arrival of inputs and difficulties in getting produce to the market (Uprichard, Zambia Daily Mail, 17 February, 1989: Times of Zambia, 28 February 1989).

Apart from affecting agricultural production, the transport problem is likely to affect the future operations of potential retail outlets, rural industries and other commercial ventures which have to depend on transport for procurement of raw materials and marketing of finished products. Private capital and initiative is also unlikely to be attracted to such areas.
3.2 Kasama District in the context of the study

Kasama District provides a good case for the study of the association between migration and the development of village industries because of a number of reasons.

Firstly, Kasama District has a long history of rural-urban migration. As Bratton (1980: 41) points out, labour migration is perhaps the most important single socio-economic fact about Kasama. For example it has been estimated that by 1912, 3957 of the 7290 taxable males in Kasama had migrated to urban areas with the rates rising to 48-60 percent by 1933 and 70 and 63 percent respectively for 1957 and 1962 (Bratton, 1980: 42). It will be seen from Table 3.1 below that the 1969 census, the first conducted by the Zambian Government, revealed a decline in the population of Kasama and other districts in the Northern Province at the time when the nation as a whole was experiencing an increase of 2.5 per annum (C.S.O, 1986: 3).
Table 3.1 Northern Province Population trends by District, 1963–85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinsali</td>
<td>71,282</td>
<td>58,014</td>
<td>66,174</td>
<td>71,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoka</td>
<td>81,851</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>93,999</td>
<td>102,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasma</td>
<td>113,614</td>
<td>107,817</td>
<td>147,594</td>
<td>192,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luwingu</td>
<td>80,644</td>
<td>79,164</td>
<td>52,596</td>
<td>52,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbala</td>
<td>91,136</td>
<td>95,633</td>
<td>113,935</td>
<td>125,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpika</td>
<td>60,263</td>
<td>59,378</td>
<td>81,291</td>
<td>95,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mporokoso</td>
<td>65,205</td>
<td>67,390</td>
<td>41,145</td>
<td>42,678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(a) The 1980 population figures show a decline in some districts such as Luwingu and Mporokoso because these districts were affected by the creation of two new districts namely: Chilubi and Kaputa.

Against this background of a long history and high rates of rural-urban migration, the district provides a good setting for studying the impact of this movement on the development of village industries.

Secondly, Kasama District was at the time of the field survey, the only district with a branch office of the Village Industry Service (VIS).
This is an organisation based in the capital city and charged with the responsibility of promoting village industries (see chapter 6). In addition, Kasama District was at the time, the only district in the country with an organisation called the Village Development Foundation (VDF). This is a non-governmental organisation concerned with promoting agriculture and village based agro-cottage and other small industries (see chapter 6). The presence of these two organisations in the district provides an opportunity for highlighting some approaches as well as prospects and constraints on the current village industrialisation programme vis-a-vis the goals envisaged by the government (see chapters 1 and 6).

Lastly considering other areas, the choice of Kasama District for study was reinforced by this researcher's familiarity with some areas in the district and officials in government departments. In addition, Kasama is the seat of a number of non-governmental organisations such as NORAD and EEC, which are carrying out projects in various districts in the Northern Province. The presence of these organisations as well as other government departments was an asset both in terms of the much needed background information on the location and nature of activities in various villages as well as in terms of transport to and from the villages considering that the research was done at the peak of the rain season and considering that most villages were without public transport.
3.3 The Study Areas

This section briefly describes the salient features of the four villages covered by this study. Map 2 shows the relative locations of the villages within Kasama District while maps 3 to 6 show the respective villages.

3.3.1 Chitimukulu

Chitimukulu has historically been, and still is, the headquarters of the centralised Bemba Empire as well as the home of the Paramount Chief Chitimukulu. At the time of the field survey the population was estimated at around 1000.

The village is located along a secondary road linking Mbala District to the Kasama-Isoka road. The distance to Kasama town is about 68 kilometres (see maps 2 and 3). The main village is located on a gently undulating upland overlooking the Kalungu river and its dambo.

---

1. No suitable population data were available for the study areas and the survey therefore included a rough estimate of numbers of people (see chapter 4).
Map 3: CHITIMUKULU VILLAGE

Map illustrating the layout of Chitimukulu Village. The main occupation of the people is farming. Most of the farm households are very low-income farmers. Typical incomes are low in most households, which is illustrated by the village school where pupils could not afford uniforms.

Formal conversations with the headmaster of the village school revealed that most children had no uniforms. As a result, children attended school without uniforms. The relative poverty in Chitimukulu probably explains why the village had the highest population of the study areas.

Source: Adapted with modifications from 1:50,000 map of Zambia sheet number 1031 B1 (1978). Survey Department, Lusaka.
The main occupation of the people is farming. Most of the farmers are subsistence farmers. Typical incomes in most households were very low compared to the other study areas. For example, the average annual income per household was K1509 compared to K3009 in Mumba and K2087 and K1740 in Nseluka and Kanyanta respectively. One indicator which illustrates the predominance of low incomes is the inability of most households to purchase school uniforms. Chitimukulu was the only village where pupils could be seen going to school without uniforms. Informal conversations with the Headmaster of the local primary school (Kanyanta Primary School) revealed that most parents had complained that they could not afford to buy uniforms. As a result children attended school without uniforms. The relative poverty in Chitimukulu probably explains why the village had the highest population of young migrants who had left the village in search of employment in urban areas. (see Appendix 5.2).

In terms of infrastructure, the village has a clinic, a primary school, a post office and a police station that was without furniture. Even the primary school had very little furniture because there was no transport to collect desks from Kasama. The village had no retail shop or a market. There was no electricity as well as piped water as the only water pump had broken down. The only bus service which was once operated by the UBZ had ceased two years before the field survey.
In the absence of retail shops, a market and public transport, people lived under extremely difficult conditions since the residents had to walk for more than 20 kilometres to the main road (Kasama-Isoka road) to find transport to take them to the district centre to buy mealie meal and other essential commodities which were never available in the village.

Most of the houses are made of mud brick and thatched with grass. Only a few houses near the clinic, post office and the primary school are made of burnt bricks with iron sheets and glass windows. Delapidated and abandoned houses, retail shops, bars and government buildings are a common sight. This along with the tall grass which had overgrown most pathways at the time of the survey gave the impression of a village which was once much bigger, concentrated and prosperous but was now on the verge of collapse.

3.3.2 Mumba

Mumba is situated in the most peripheral location of Kasama District over 100 kilometres from the district centre. It is one of the many villages that lie along the vast Chambeshi flats straddling the Chambeshi river (see map 4). Although the village is almost half the size of Chitimukulu in terms of area, it has roughly the same population. The population was estimated at around 1000 people during the field survey.
As indicated on the map, population density is quite high along the Chambeshi Flats area. The village does not have much in terms of infrastructure. It is connected only by a narrow dirt road which is impassable during the rainy season. There is a primary school which serves all the villages in the area.

The village was representative of the Zambian Co-operative Movement, and the European Inland Co-operative (EIC). The village has a representative of the movement at the time of the survey who took over the project.

A health centre was built some 10 years before the field survey and it is well equipped. However, the hospital was not in operation. The village has no market or shops, and all the surrounding areas had to travel to the hospital in Kasama.

The village was representative of the Zambian Co-operative Movement, and the European Inland Co-operative (EIC). The village has a representative of the movement at the time of the survey who took over the project.
As indicated in section 3.1 the population density is quite high along the Chambeshi flats area.

Like Chitimukulu, the village does not have much in terms of infrastructure. It is linked to the main road leading to Kasama (Kasama-Isoka road) via a small farm road which becomes impassable during the rain season. There is a primary school which serves all the villages shown in map 4. It also has a small two roomed guest house belonging to the IRDP.

The village has two Agricultural Assistants and one representative of the Zambia Co-operative Federation (ZCF) and the European Economic Community (EEC). The ZCF in the area is assisting members of the Multipurpose Co-operative Society with loans to purchase cows, fertilisers, seedrice, ploughs and ox-carts. Meanwhile EEC had at the time of the survey just taken over the projects left by IRDP particularly in the field of assisting farmers with seedrice, fertilisers, and extension services (see footnote, chapter 6). The village does not, however, have piped water, retail shops, a market or a clinic. A clinic which was built some 10 years before the field survey on self help basis had not been opened because the Ministry of Health had not been able to provide the staff and medicines. Hence the local people had to travel to the hospital in Kasama for medical treatment.
Rice growing is the main economic activity seconded by fishing. Most of the fish caught is marketed in the district centre. Some farmers own herds of cattle as an additional source of income. Typical village incomes in most households were demonstrably high in relation to the other sample clusters and it is presumably no accident that townward migration of young men and women particularly for reasons of employment is rare (see chapter 5). In addition Mumba had a comparatively younger population in relation to the other sample clusters when the age structure of household heads is considered. For example, it will be seen from the table in Appendix 3.2 that Mumba had the largest proportion of household heads (63 percent) in the age group (20-40 years) compared to 40, 32 and 23 percent in Chitimukulu, Nseluka and Kanyanta respectively. At the same time it will be seen from the same table that Mumba had the lowest proportion of household heads (37 percent) in the old age group (over 40 years) compared to 60, 68 and 77 percent in Chitimukulu, Nseluka and Kanyanta respectively. The foregoing demonstrates that rural areas could be attractive to young men if opportunities for earning cash income are available (see chapter 7).
Unlike Chitimukulu, the houses in Mumba are more closely spaced and well maintained. Abandoned houses are a rare sight. The available spaces between the well maintained pathways are planted with either food crops or fruit trees. The fruit trees and food crops provide an additional source of income as a ready market is provided not only by the local people but also people who come to buy fish and sell finished products like soap, salt and mealie meal.

Furthermore, in pleasant contrast to the dull and quiet life in Chitimukulu, a visitor to Mumba is presented with a bustle of activity as some people come to buy fish and sell finished products while others can be seen going to the district centre to sell fish and buy some essential commodities. Occasionally a vanette or lorry can be seen with people travelling to or from Kasama town. In other words the atmosphere in Mumba is one of a stable and productive village situation.

The village has great potential for many kinds of village industries. Rice milling is one example. Fish processing and canning is another. In addition, the damp climate and clay-loam soils seem to be favourable for the growth of many kinds of fruit trees. This could stimulate industry based on fruit canning. In particular, mulberry trees could stimulate industry based on jam making and silkworm rearing and weaving as the
silkworms grow well on mulberry trees. For example, at the time of the field survey, the Small Industries Development Organisation (SIDO) had just opened a branch office in Kasama. Officials at the branch office were carrying out a pilot project on the rearing of silkworms on mulberry trees. The project was being funded by the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO). This potential, however, has yet to be exploited. Despite having a large market potential provided by the large population along the Chambeshi flats with a relatively high per capita purchasing power, and despite being a major rice and fishing area, the economic relationship of the Chambeshi area to the district centre is that of a raw material reservoir for the rice mills and fish markets in the district and other urban centres.

3.3.3 Nseluka

The settlement at Nseluka started as a resettlement of scattered populations into one large village. This was in response to a government policy of village regrouping adopted in the decade after independence. The policy was adopted with the intention of rationalising the extension of rural social services, creating growth centres and helping to eliminate disparities between rural and urban centres in opportunities for employment, income and social services (Bratton, 1980: 25).

Nseluka is straddled at a communication junction 33 kilometres north of Kasama town. The junction lies at the point
Map 5: NSELUKA VILLAGE

Source: Adapted with modifications from 1:50,000 map of Zambia, sheet number 0931 C4 (1980), Survey Dept. Lusaka
where the main north-south road in the district linking Kasama and Mbala meets the eastward all weather road to Nakonde (see map 5). In addition, Nseluka railway station is at the point at which the TAZARA swings southward after its southwest journey from Dar-es-Salaam in Tanzania.

In contrast with the other sample clusters Nseluka is a much larger settlement in terms of built up area. In addition, Nseluka has brick houses with iron sheets and glass windows aligned neatly along the main road. The latter was in response to a government directive during the village regrouping exercise.

Infrastructure is well developed in the form of a primary school which at the time of the survey had expanded to include a basic secondary school. There is also a clinic, one Community Development Assistant and two Agricultural Assistants. There are two retail shops, three bars and three churches. In addition, although the village no longer has piped water due to the broken water pump, it is well supplied with water from the wells built with Irish Aid. In terms of accessibility to the district centre the village is well linked because in addition to the passenger train the road between Kasama and Mbala and the eastward all weather road are usually laden with traffic enabling the villagers to hire vanettes and lorries to and from Kasama town.
The majority of people are farmers. Trade in fish and other finished products from Kasama and Nakonde on the border with Tanzania is another thriving activity especially amongst the younger men and women. Beer brewing is apparently an important income generating activity especially in the female headed households. The income derived from beer brewing is however not high as compared to farming. For example, the highest recorded income from the sale of beer was K800 per year which is much less compared to K10,000 per annum recorded in some farming households.

Availability of land for farming, easy access to the district centre and the well developed infrastructure have combined to attract many settlers to Nseluka making it one of the largest rural villages in Kasama with an estimated population of 700 in 1980 (Bratton, 1980: 128). During the field survey for this study the population was estimated at 2,500. The large population in Nseluka provides a large potential market for the products of potential village industries.

3.3.4 Kanyanta

Kanyanta is a linear settlement straddled along the motor road linking Kasama to Isoka (see maps 2 and 6). The distance from Kasama to Kanyanta by road is about 38 kilometres.
Map 6: KANYANTA VILLAGE
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From Kasama, Kanyanta is approached by road through a gently undulating land which is covered by a dambo on the eastern side. The latter is the source of Luchindashi river (see map 6). Aligned along the road are brick houses with iron-sheets and glass windows. Most of the houses, however, are made of mud bricks and thatched with grass.

Farming is the main occupation of the people. Most of the farmers are subsistence farmers. A few households keep goats as an additional source of income. The average herd size was about 5 animals. Fish trade is another side line activity particularly in the dry season when no farming takes place. The fish is bought from the Chambeshi area over 90 kilometres away and is marketed in the district centre and Mungwi township some nine kilometres away (see map 2).

Other than the main road along which the village is situated, the village has little in terms of infrastructure. The village does not have a primary school, retail shops, a market, clinic or piped water. The limited infrastructure is probably due to the fact that Kanyanta is still a small village both in terms of built up area and population. For example the estimated population in the main village was about 700 as compared to 2500 in Nseluka. Most of the services are obtained from Mungwi township which is also the main market for farm produce such as fresh maize, cassava and sweet potatoes.
As with Chitimukulu the atmosphere is dull with few opportunities for employment or self-employment for young men and women. The only activity in the village can be seen at the Village Development Foundation (VDF) centre where some carpentry workshop, maize mill, homemaking and literacy club, and a preschool have been introduced (see chapter 6).
CHAPTER 4

OBJECTIVES AND METHODS OF THE SURVEY

This chapter outlines the objectives, hypotheses and methodology employed in gathering the data and testing the hypotheses. Also outlined, are the concepts and definitions of various variables used in the text. Some problems and lessons from the method of the survey are also mentioned.

4.1 Objectives of the survey

The study sought to investigate the inter-relationship between rural-urban migration and the development of village industries. Specifically it aimed at:

(i) Analysing the effect of rural-urban migration on the development of village industries. The specific questions looked at were: Does rural-urban migration reduce the labour supply for village industries? Does this out-migration from villages reduce the incomes of affected households thereby reducing the market for the products from village industries? What role do urban to rural remittances and return-migration play in the development of village industries? For example, are return migrants more active in village industries than non-migrants? Do return migrants come with skills which are of use in the development of village industries? (chapter 5).
(ii) Finding out if the development of village industries had helped to achieve the government's goals of:

(a) providing wage employment to the rural population
(b) improving the living conditions of the rural population
(c) reducing rural-urban migration; and
(d) encouraging the return of migrants to villages (chapter 6)

(iii) Making recommendations on the basis of the findings on policies relating to migration and village industries which can be applicable not only to the Northern Province, but also to other provinces as well (chapter 7).

4.2 HYPOTHESES

The study had two sets of hypotheses. There are those that relate to migration in line with objective (i) above, and those relating to village industries in line with objective (ii) above.

Migration hypotheses

The first hypothesis is that rural-urban migration reduces the labour supply for village industries. The assumption underlying this hypothesis is that rural-urban migration
deprives the villages of the young and better educated members who are likely to be most active in village industries both as entrepreneurs as well as employees of village industries. The assumption is based on findings from studies in both developed and developing nations that rural-urban migration is a selective process: migrants are generally younger and better educated than non-migrants. Furthermore the studies show that entrepreneurs of small scale industry tend to be younger and more educated (Liedholm, 1973; Liedholm and Chuta, 1975; 1976). Hence it is reasonable to expect these latter entrepreneurs to recruit younger and educated members who are more likely to share the same aspirations, and values.

The second hypothesis is that an inverse relationship exists between the rate of rural-urban migration and household income. The higher the number of household members absent the lower will be the household income because there will be fewer hands to help in farming and other cash earning and related jobs. Furthermore, by reducing household incomes, out-migration also reduces the demand (market) for village industry products, the argument being that rural production of consumer goods will not thrive if local incomes are low, but will tend to develop simultaneously as these are raised (Livingstone, 1969; Byerlee, Eicher and Liedholm, 1977).
The third hypothesis is that more return migrants than non-migrants participate in village industries, both as entrepreneurs as well as employees of village industries. The hypothesised relationship is based on studies made in other parts of Zambia which have shown that return migrants are more progressive and that more of them than non-migrants participate in various kinds of rural development projects (Chanda, 1985; Chilivumbo, 1980).

The fourth hypothesis is that remittances and savings made in urban areas by migrants, constitute the major source of capital for village industries.

Hypotheses relating to village Industries

The fifth hypothesis is that village industries provide significantly more sources of wage employment opportunities than other activities in the villages.

The sixth hypothesis is that a negative relationship exists between the rate of rural-urban migration and the number of village industries in the village. The larger the number of small-scale industrial establishments in the village the lower will be the number of people leaving because opportunities for wage employment will be available locally.

The seventh hypothesis is that higher household incomes are associated with households whose members are employed in village industries. In rural areas where sources of a cash income are often lacking or erratic it is reasonable to expect people
employed in village industries to have higher household incomes since they are at least able to get a cash income regularly.

The eighth hypothesis is that villages with more village industries have consistently and significantly more return migrants than villages with fewer village industries. The presence of a large number of small-scale industries will be able to attract more return migrants who may want to invest their money in these enterprises. Furthermore a large number of small-scale industries may be an indication that the village has great potential for development, a major consideration of return migrants.

4.3 Concepts and definition of variables

In order to facilitate the interpretation of the results an outline of major concepts and variables used is necessary.

Rates of migration

The rate of migration was defined as the percentage of rural family members who migrated and were resident in urban areas at the time of the survey. This rate was computed by dividing the total number of migrants per family (household) by the total number of people in the family and expressing the results as a percentage thus:

\[ m = \frac{M}{p} . k \]

where \( m \) = migration rate
\( M \) = Number of migrants
\( p \) = Population at risk
\( k \) = Constant ie 100

(Source: G.J. Lewis, 1982).
In this study the term out-migration is used interchangeably with migration rate.

Migration

For the purpose of this study a migrant was an individual who had crossed a village boundary to an urban area for a period longer than one year.

A return migrant was defined as an individual who had returned to his/her village after at least one year of absence in an urban area.

A non-migrant was defined as an individual who had resided in his village of birth all his life. Included in this category were individuals who had at one time or another migrated to other rural areas.

"Urban" and "Rural"

"Urban" areas refer to the "old" line of rail urban industrial centres which had populations of over 24,000 while the other rural service centres and administrative centres had up to 13,000 during the 1969 census. This is the definition adopted by most writers (Jackman, 1973) and was the one that was used in this study. Towns which were included in each category were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lusaka</td>
<td>Chingola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafue</td>
<td>Luanshya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndola urban</td>
<td>Livingstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingstone</td>
<td>Chililabombwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabwe urban</td>
<td>Kalulushi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mufulira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: M. E. Jackman, 1973)
Village Industry/Small-Scale Industry or Enterprise

A village industry was defined as a non-farm enterprise located in a village and involved in extraction, processing or manufacturing of goods as well as repair of manufactured goods. The definition included one-man operated establishments as well as larger establishments employing up to 50 people.\(^1\)

Employment refers to all those working in village industries (other than the ownership of these enterprises) on full-time or part-time basis or merely as members of households. The upper limit of 50 employees was adopted because it is the dividing line between large and small-scale industry that is adopted by most small-scale industry studies as well as government organisations (Liedholm and Chuta, 1975; Milimo and Fisseha 1985; Ng'andwe, 1982).

The definition excluded enterprises without a fixed location of operations and trading such as a grocery involved in the sale of manufactured goods made elsewhere. However, trading, selling of fish, pottery, honey and other goods were termed village industry if the goods sold were extracted or produced locally and if the enterprises met the other conditions outlined above.

---

1. Initially the lower limit of employees was set at 3 so as to exclude petty and temporary enterprises. After the pilot survey however, it was observed that such enterprises would be difficult to find since the majority of enterprises are very small operations. Moreover it was observed that some one man enterprises produce more goods than others with many employees.
The relative social and economic advantage of village industries will be judged by reference to the amounts and range of goods and services provided, employment generated, and the material wellbeing of village industry employees as compared to non-village industry employees.

Employment generated by village industries is measured by finding the proportion of wage employment in this sector as compared to other sectors in the village.

**Village**

A village was defined as a clustered (nucleated) rural settlement falling within an electoral area called a branch. According to the UNIP Constitution (1978), a branch contains at least 250 households, which was considered to be an adequate sampling frame for this kind of study.

The village chosen had to be truly rural and not located in a rural town or directly influenced by proximity of a town.

**Household**

A household was defined as a group of people who live, work, and eat together from the same pot. Usually the group has one head, generally a man, who directs the affairs of the household. Patterns of residence differ from area to area. In some areas members of a family may sleep under separate roofs, in others they may share the same house. In practice it was left to the researcher and research assistant to make arbitrary choice. So far no difficulties were encountered in segregating households.
Household Income

Household income was defined as household earnings from the sale of crops and other products including the sale of household labour. The latter is represented by the variable (EARN). Total household earnings (TOTEARN) was defined as household income plus income from remittances. (AVREMA) refers to the total amount of remittances received by a household in a year. Information for all the above variables was provided by household heads.

Rural Socio-economic Development

Rural socio-economic development refers to a broad process involving the process of increasing the level of participation of the rural population in the development process, and the improvement of the level of living of the rural population as reflected in improved housing, education, nutrition and health. It also includes economic growth as reflected in increased agricultural production as well as diversification of rural economic activities such as small scale-industries, groceries, maize mills, bars etc.

A study of villages at different stages and in different conditions of the development process presupposes their classification in the light of all the conditions mentioned in the preceding paragraph. In reality it proved difficult since such sets of data are not easy to obtain.
Hence household income has been used as a proxy for comparing levels of socio-economic development. By comparing total household income recorded in respective sample clusters, frequent reference is made to "high income settlement" or "low income settlement". In the same way material well being of the household is measured with reference to household incomes. Hence occasional reference is made to some "low income" or "poor households" and "high income" or "rich households". These subdivisions have been devised to facilitate analysis and comparison and should not be considered significant.

4.4 Structure of the survey

As mentioned earlier in the introduction, field work for this study was carried out within Kasama District where four purposively chosen villages were surveyed.

Field work took three months from late January to late March, 1988. The first month was devoted to a pilot survey. The pilot survey covered four districts namely: Kasama, Mpika, Chinsali and Isoka. The reason for visiting more than one district was to see whether variations existed in the kind of village industries in different socio-economic and ecological environments and to assist in drawing a sampling frame. Initially it was planned to visit more districts. This, however, was not done because it became apparent that no significant differences exist in the kind of village industries found in different districts. The most common village
industries are carpentry, milling and traditional crafts. Similar observations have been made by Milimo (1987). Furthermore, most villages do not have village industries. Those that have got one or two village industries are often many kilometres apart. In view of the fact that the research was done during the peak of the rainy season and considering that there was no public transport available it became too costly and was considered unfruitful to continue with the pilot survey. Hence it was decided to do the main field work in one district, Kasama.

Apart from being economical, the choice of Kasama for detailed study was influenced by the fact that Kasama had more villages which were not as scattered as in other districts visited. In addition Kasama had offices belonging to the Village Industry Service (VIS) and the Village Development Foundation (VDF). These organisations provided this researcher with the necessary information which was not easily available in other districts. By providing information on their projects and affording this researcher an opportunity to visit some of them it was easy to draw up the necessary sampling frame. Since most villages did not have village industries, the villages with projects funded by either VIS or VDF provided a useful starting point in drawing the sampling frame.

In order to select the villages to be studied, a list of villages with projects by either VIS or VDF was drawn. It was
then decided to choose those villages which had one or two other village industries in addition to those by the aforementioned institutions.

The fact that random methods were not used in the selection of villages is justified on grounds that random methods would have yielded villages with no village industries or villages with the same kind of village industries. Interest was not merely reporting that there are no village industries or that the village industries are the same. The important thing is to highlight the impact of the few village industries, different kinds if possible, in terms of the government goals outlined earlier in the chapter.

From each of the selected villages thirty households and forty in the case of Nseluka were randomly selected giving a total sample size of 130 households. The households were randomly selected by dividing the villages into blocks of three and four in the case of Nseluka, from which ten households were randomly selected. The larger number of sampled households in Nseluka was because the latter settlement was large not only in terms of area and number of households but also in terms of the study unit, the branch.

The main source of data were the interview schedules. Two sets of interview schedules were provided. One set was prepared for village household heads, while the other was prepared for village industry proprietors (see Appendix 4.4 for
more details on interview schedules). The schedule for household heads elicited information on their social and economic characteristics, migration history, family size, number of migrants, their characteristics and reasons for migration. Information was also collected on the nature of goods purchased from local village industries as well as the levels of satisfaction with the goods. The interview schedule for the proprietors elicited information on their social and economic characteristics, migration history, and source of capital. Information was also collected on the types of goods produced, number and types of workers, machinery used, types and sources of raw materials, marketing products etc.

The interview schedules were administered by this researcher and one research assistant. Interviews took place in the morning from 10.00 am to 12.00 pm and in the afternoon from 16.00 hours to 17.00 hours when the families returned from their fields. The interviews were normally conducted with the household heads. Where the household head was not available the wife (in the case of the male headed households) or the eldest son or daughter was interviewed instead.

If all the elder members were absent then the household was skipped and the next one picked. On the whole there was excellent co-operation from the respondents.
Only two household heads, one in Chitimukulu and the other in Mumba refused to be interviewed. The reasons for refusing to be interviewed were that there had been many other researchers before, and so far nothing was forthcoming from the government. It was later learned that both were members of the Watch Tower Sect, a religious group that is often against certain government practices such as singing the national anthem.

4.5 Hypothesis testing

To test the hypothesis a combination of descriptive parametric and non-parametric tests were used. The main test used however, is the Chi-Square test since most of the data were reduced to frequencies.

Parametric techniques included simple correlation and regression. These were used to test the presumed relationship between migration and household income (see hypothesis 2). There it was considered plausible that the higher the number of migrants in the household the lower will be the household income. Since household income and the number of migrants are in principle quantifiable, correlation and regression seemed the most appropriate tools to use for measuring the form, strength and significance of the relationship.

To use regression in the context of prediction and estimation however requires that certain assumptions be fulfilled such as: The data sets have to be linear, the data has to be normally distributed, and the relationship has to be
fairly strong between two or more variables. These assumptions were not however fulfilled. For this reason regression is only used in a descriptive context particularly in the examination of residuals.

In chapter 6 much of hypothesis testing is essentially descriptive which is often the case in an exploratory kind of research (Peil, 1985) such as this one. This is because the chapter focuses on village industries and these were very limited both in terms of number of establishments as well as the number of employees. Consequently this limited the number and range of statistical tests which could be used. This limitation will not necessarily vitiate all the generalisations that might be drawn out but it needs to be borne in mind.

4.6 Some limitations and lessons from the methods of the survey

Certain limitations in the methods of survey need to be pointed out. The first one pertains to the design of the interview schedules. Most of the questions in the interview schedules particularly the one for household heads were of the closed type. This, while facilitating the recording of information complicated its recovery, limiting the range of statistical tools which could be used. For example, in analysing the relationship between migration and household income, it became necessary to disaggregate household incomes by such aspects as age of household head and migrants, which was not easy because the recorded ages were grouped into categories.
The second one relates to the size of the sample. The size of the sample at village level limited the range of statistical tools which could be used. In particular, when cross tabulations between variables were performed, there were a lot of empty cells. As a result most results from cross tabulations could not be used. It is for this reason that the spatial variations in the relationship between migration and household income is not accounted for in chapter 5.

The third pertains to the calculation of household income. In calculating household income certain information on expenses was not obtained. Although household heads were asked to indicate the number of bags they forfeited as repayment of loans, information on labour and land clearing expenses was not obtained. Furthermore, there were a number of households especially in Chitimukulu who indicated their annual income as zero. Although this seemed unconvincing little could be done about it. Hence overall income figures are very rough indicators at best.

The fourth relates to the comparisons of the proportion of people employed by village industries and other sectors. Ideally this information should have been collected by counting all the people employed in various sectors. This, however, was not done and the comparisons are based on information from sampled households. Although this may not be a limitation in this particular study on account of the limited number of people
in employment, it must be mentioned so that future researchers may bear it in mind.

Not all limitations given above could have been capable of correction. The calculation of household incomes is a case in point. As Simmons et. al. (1984) have pointed out, measurement of family income in rural areas is difficult considering that the domestic income component bypasses the money market, making its measurement relatively uncertain. Hence even if an attempt to record all expenses is made the figures obtained would only be rough indicators.

Finally, the sample size limited the range of statistical tools that have been used, but this had to be weighed against limited time and finances available for both data collection and analysis.

In conclusion it must be pointed out that while there was great scope for inaccuracy and bias in certain aspects such as household incomes in other subjects such as the demographic picture and absent members, the general information is correct since most questions were related and hence it was easy to detect any inconsistencies. Since no inconsistencies were detected, it suggests that the data can be considered reliable.
CHAPTER 5

RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE VILLAGE INDUSTRIES

Introduction

This chapter will not attempt to draw up a balance sheet of costs and benefits of migration to village industries, but will simply present some of the evidence emerging from the survey that may have a bearing on this question and which may perhaps have implications for Zambia's internal migration policy. Field data and observations are used to answer the questions which were outlined in the last chapter regarding the impact of migration on village industries.

In attempting to provide answers to the outlined questions emphasis will be placed on testing the hypotheses which were also outlined in the last chapter.

The information is sometimes presented in disaggregated form to show the differences among the four sample clusters surveyed. The data in the text and tables are given in percentages. The corresponding raw data are given in the appendices.

Tables in the appendices are arranged in the same order as in the text.
5.1 General Findings

A total of 130 household heads were interviewed representing a sum of 764 household members, household heads inclusive. Eighteen percent of the household members were absent (had migrated to urban areas) at the time of survey. Of the four sample clusters Nseluka had the highest absentee rate (23%) followed by Kanyanta with 21%. Mumba had the lowest number of absentees (8%) followed by Chitimikulu with 16 percent. (See Table 5.1)

Table 5.1 Percentage of adult household members absent by village and sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Proportion of adult males absent: percent of total sample</th>
<th>Proportion of adult females absent: percent of total sample</th>
<th>Total number of adults absent: percent of total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data.
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The out-migration rates in Table 5.1 are surprisingly low compared to those recorded not only in Kasama District (see chapter 3), but also in other parts of the country in the era before and immediately after independence in 1964. Richardson (1953) for example, in her study of two villages in the Mpika District (in the Northern Province of Zambia) found migration rates to be as high as 48 and 68 percentage for men, and 3 and 12 percent respectively for women, while Obadike (1972) reported them to be as high as 77 percent in the period immediately after independence.

This decline in the proportion of people migrating to urban areas has been reported by a number of writers (Chilivumbo, 1980; SATEP, ILO report, 1985; C.S.O, 1985). This decline has been attributed to the overall worsening economic situation in Zambia which has greatly limited opportunities for employment in urban areas (SATEP, ILO report, 1985; C.S.O, 1985:17). It is interesting to note that at the time of the field survey by this researcher, none of the interviewed households reported an absentee (migrant) household head, a feature uncommon in past times. Hence the out-migration under discussion in the subsequent pages is that of dependent household members and not heads of households.
5.2 Loss of the most able and active

In this section the hypothesis that rural-urban migration reduces the labour supply for village industries is tested. The initial assumption was that rural-urban migration deprives the villages of the young and better educated members who are likely to be most active in village industries both as entrepreneurs as well as employees of the village industries.

Survey results

The sample population clearly displayed the selective character of migration. The general finding across villages was that most migrants (76 percent) were drawn from the young age group (see Table 5.2) with only 22 percent coming from the middle age group. There were no migrants in the old age group.

Table 5.2 Percentage of migrants in different age groups by village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Age groups of migrants</th>
<th>Don't know/No response</th>
<th>Total number of migrants in village (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 years and less</td>
<td>20-30 years</td>
<td>40 years and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(young age group)</td>
<td>(middle age group)</td>
<td>(old age group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=135

Source: Field data
Rural-urban migration was selective not only in terms of age, it was also selective in terms of education. This was particularly evident amongst the young adult migrants aged 19 years and less. It will be seen from Table 5.2 that the percentage of young adult migrants was highest in Mumba with 93 percent, followed by Chitimukulu with 89 percent. Kanyanta and Nseluka had comparatively lower rates of out-migration amongst young adult migrants (68 and 71 percent respectively). The comparatively high rates of out-migration by young adult migrants in Mumba and Chitimukulu seem to be partly due to the influence of education. Table 5.3 for example, shows the levels of education of migrants at the time of migration. It will be seen from the table that in Mumba and Chitimukulu not only have all migrants received some education, but there are also comparatively more migrants that had some secondary education. We should therefore expect among other reasons a larger number migrating to further their education in urban areas (Chitimukulu 26% and Mumba 33%, see Appendix 5.2). In contrast Nseluka and Kanyanta had 20 and 21 percent respectively of migrants who had no formal education (Table 5.3). Consequently these latter villages had fewer migrants that had migrated for educational reasons (Nseluka 22%, Kanyanta 15%, see Appendix 5.2). These survey results are in line with the findings made elsewhere (Caldwell 1969: 62; Rousel 1970 cited by Simmons et. al,
1984:44; Clunies Ross 1984:123) that schooling increases an individual’s chance of leaving the village. Rousel (1970) for example, in his Ivory Coast survey found the percentage of migrants migrating to continue education in big towns to be as high as 75 percent amongst those with primary education, and as low as 11 percent amongst those with no formal education. This clearly illustrates the point implicitly stated earlier on that educated villagers seem more likely to migrate than uneducated ones.

If the probability of migrating is higher among those who have received some formal education, then it may be concluded that migration was drawing the better educated in the study areas, even though comparative figures for non-migrants were not obtained.

Table 5.3 Level of education of migrants at the time of out-migration. Summary of findings by village (Percent of total migrants).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Level of education of migrants</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total number of migrants n=135 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu -</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Villages</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
Having established that rural-urban migration in the study areas was drawing the younger and better educated, the next question of empirical significance is: Did this out-migration deprive the villages of their most able and active members who might otherwise promote village industries both as entrepreneurs or employees? Survey data provided answers to this question.

The findings show that entrepreneurs of village industries were not drawn from the young age group. On the contrary entrepreneurs were drawn from the middle and old age group, with the majority coming from the latter group (see Table 5.4). This finding is in line with the findings by Milimo (1987), in his Northern Province of Zambia survey in which he indicated that only nine percent of the rural small-scale enterprises are owned by those aged 20 years and less. This finding however, differs from those by Chilivumbo, et, al. 1988, from their Luapula Province survey and those by Liedholm and Chuta (1975; 1976) and Liedholm (1973) from their West African survey in which they have indicated that entrepreneurs of rural-small industries tend to be younger.

The differences in the findings outlined above can be explained by the fact that this study's classification of age groups into three categories is different from those used by Liedholm (1973), Liedholm and Chuta (1975; 1976) and Chilivumbo, et. al, (1988). The study by Chilivumbo, et.al, (1988) for
example classifies those below 40 years as young, and 40-59 as middle age while the old age group is from 60 years and above. If however, this study's classification was adopted then the other scholars cited above would have arrived at the same conclusion that the young age group is not very active in rural small-scale industries.

Table 5.4 Percentage of village industry entrepreneurs in different age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of entrepreneurs (Percent of total number entrepreneurs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 years and less</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39 years</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years and above</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of entrepreneurs</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

In order to ascertain the effect of out-migration on the labour supply for village industries, the entrepreneurs of village industries were asked a number of questions. Firstly, they were asked to indicate whether they would prefer to employ someone who was young or old? Secondly, they were asked to indicate whether or not education is a major consideration when recruiting employees. Finally, they were asked to indicate whether or not, they experience any labour shortages as a result of out-migration of young adults to urban areas. These questions and the responses obtained are shown in Appendix 5.2.
The subsequent paragraph outlines the findings in brief.

The majority of entrepreneurs (54%) indicated that they would prefer to employ someone young. One entrepreneur indicated preference for someone middle aged, while another indicated preference for someone old.

The preference for older employees was justified on the ground that these could be more committed to work as well as being honest when entrusted with handling funds.

With reference to education, most entrepreneurs (85%) indicated that education is not an important consideration. Only two entrepreneurs (15%) indicated that they might consider education when recruiting employees. When asked to indicate the desired level of education, one chairlady of the soap making co-operative indicated that the potential employee would need to have at least primary education to enable her to write or read the records of the co-operative. Another chairlady of the soap making co-operative indicated preference for secondary education on the same grounds. Both women however, indicated that the afore-mentioned were only preferred levels of education, but not necessarily the criteria. Last but not least, all but one entrepreneur indicated that labour shortages were unheard of. Even the one entrepreneur who indicated labour shortage did mention that labour shortages were not due to the absence of young men in the village. According to him the shortage of labour was due to the fact that most young men could not be
trusted to operate the mill especially when funds were involved. To summarise, the findings show that:-

(i) Migration is a selective process, most migrants were young and "better educated".

(ii) Most village industry entrepreneurs would prefer to employ someone young.

(iii) Education is not an important consideration when employees for village industries are being recruited.

(iv) Village industries do not experience labour shortages attributable to out-migration.

From the foregoing it is apparent that although out-migration to urban areas draws the younger and better educated members from villages, this does not seem to affect the labour supply for village industries because of the following reasons:-

(i) Although migration draws the better educated from the villages, formal education is not a major consideration when recruiting employees. Findings and observations in the field indicated that most jobs in village industries required elementary skills which could also be performed by those who had never been to school

(ii) Village industries have no labour supply problems. On the contrary, observations in the field suggest that there is an abundant supply of under-utilised labour in the villages. In
large part, this is due to the declining number of young men migrating to urban areas, which was mentioned earlier in the chapter.

From the foregoing it is apparent that the findings do not support the postulated hypothesis that out-migration reduces the labour supply for village industries because it draws the younger and better educated members who might promote village industries both as entrepreneurs or employees. On the basis of these findings alone the aforementioned hypothesis is rejected.

Conclusion

The section has outlined some of the evidence emerging from the survey, which has helped to shed light on the effect of out-migration on the labour supply as well as potential human capital needed to manage village industries. The initial assumption that out-migration from the villages may be resulting in labour shortages as well as depriving rural areas of potential village industry entrepreneurs is not matched by any evidence. Not only is there an abundant supply of underutilised labour, the findings also show that the younger and better educated members are the least active as entrepreneurs of village industries. The implications of these findings are discussed at the end of the chapter. For the moment it can only be concluded that rather than being detrimental to village industries in terms of labour supply, migration may be beneficial since it services labour and social mobility of the
migrants, satisfying some of the needs which cannot be met in the villages.

5.3 Out-migration and household incomes

This section focuses on the relationship between out-migration and household incomes. The initial general assumption as indicated in hypothesis 2 (chapter 4) was that the higher the number of household members absent the lower will be the household income because there will be fewer hands to help in farming and other cash earning and related jobs. It was further assumed that by reducing household incomes, out-migration also reduces the demand for village industry products.

The subsequent presentation and analysis of data is based on results of Pearson correlation coefficients and regression analysis. This is supplemented by other statistical findings such as cross tabulations, as well as data of a more qualitative nature as obtained through observation and informal conversation.

Terms used in correlation matrices include EARN, TOTEARN, AVREMA, TOTHOUSE and TOTDC. EARN, TOTEARN and AVREMA have already been defined in chapter 4. TOTHOUSE means total number of people in the household, while TOTDC refers to the total number of dependent children in the household. Last but not least TOTWAY refers to the total number of adult members in the household, who were absent and had migrated to urban areas at the time of survey.
In addition to the aforementioned variables, using the average (mean) figures as the dividing line, households have been classified into high income (HINCOME), and low income (LINCOME), large households (HTOUTHOU) and small households (LTOUTHOU), households with many dependent children (HTOTDC) and households with few dependent children (LTOTDC), households with few absent members/household with low out-migration rates (LMIG) and households with many absent members/households with high out-migration rates (HMIG). In addition households receiving remittances higher than average have been called high value remittance receiving households (HAVRMA) and those receiving less than average as low value remittance receiving households.

Finally for the sake of brevity Chitimukulu is sometimes referred to as "low-income" settlement on account of low overall incomes (see Table 5.7) as well as a comparatively large number of low income households (see Appendix 5.3). Similarly Mumba is sometimes referred to as a "high-income" settlement on account of the high overall incomes (Table 5.7) as well as a comparatively larger number of "high income" households (Appendix 5.3).

Unless otherwise indicated the subsequent presentation and analysis of data refers to the whole sample and not individual sample clusters.
Statistical results

The results of the Pearson correlation analysis are given in Table 5.5 A and B. The general finding across villages as postulated is that a negative relationship exists between household incomes (EARN) and the number of absent adult members (TOTWAY). Both the correlation and regression coefficients (Table 5.5 A and Table 5.6) have negative signs implying that out-migration (TOTWAY) is associated with a decline in household incomes (EARN).

Table 5.5A. Pearson Correlation Coefficients across and by village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTWAY</th>
<th>AVREMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All villages EARN</td>
<td>-0.0691</td>
<td>.0208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>(112)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.235</td>
<td>p=.414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTWAY</th>
<th>AVREMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu EARN</td>
<td>-0.691</td>
<td>-0.0220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>(112)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.482</td>
<td>p=.459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTWAY</th>
<th>AVREMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mumba EARN</td>
<td>.2214</td>
<td>-0.0699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTWAY</td>
<td>AVREMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>-0.0836</td>
<td>.24444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>-0.2217</td>
<td>.2444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to interpretation of figures

1. The first value i.e. -0.2217 in Kanyanta is the coefficient.
2. The figures in brackets indicate the number of observations used excluding missing values.
3. p= indicates the probability of the relationship having occurred by chance. Relationship is significant if p<.01 or .05. In all cases 1 tailed test was used.

Source: Field data
### Table 5.5B Pearson Correlation Coefficients across and by village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTWAY</th>
<th>EARN</th>
<th>AVREMA</th>
<th>FARM</th>
<th>TOTWAY</th>
<th>AVREMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>-0.1154</td>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>0.0918</td>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>p=.164</td>
<td>p=.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>0.0855</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>.2213</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>p=.327</td>
<td>p=.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>0.2229</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>-0.0423</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>p=.118</td>
<td>p=.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nscluka</td>
<td>-0.2405</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>0.1427</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>p=.067</td>
<td>p=.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>-0.0768</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>0.2224</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>p=.343</td>
<td>p=.119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to interpretation of figures is given in Table 5.5 A

Source: Field data
Table 5.6 Regression Coefficients obtained from regression of household income on out-migration (Figures in parenthesis are standard errors of estimates).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Slope term (b)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Percent of T variation explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARN</td>
<td>TOTWAY</td>
<td>-132.04</td>
<td>.4692</td>
<td>0.00477</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(181.7)</td>
<td>(-0.00472)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTEARN</td>
<td>TOTWAY</td>
<td>-(125.472)</td>
<td>.8903</td>
<td>0.00118</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(310.769)</td>
<td>(-0.00792)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.INCOME</td>
<td>HMIG</td>
<td>-905.852</td>
<td>.0354*</td>
<td>.37138</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(372)</td>
<td>(.30850)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Regression equations and coefficients were not meant to be used in the context of prediction and estimation. They were meant to be used in a descriptive context particularly Regression No. 2 and 3 which have been used to examine residuals shown in figure 5.1 A and B. *5% significance :p,0.05. In all cases on a one tailed test.

Source: Field data
An examination of the strength of the correlation coefficient between out-migration (TOTWAY) and household income (EARN) however, suggests a very weak relationship ($r = -0.0691$) which is not statistically significant at both the 0.1 and .05 significance levels. When the coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.0047$) is examined it suggests that out-migration explains about .5 percent of the variation in household incomes. This means there is still more than 98 percent of the variation in household incomes which is still unexplained. This suggests that in the sample cluster as a whole, the effect of out-migration in reducing household incomes is very marginal.

**Effect of remittances on household incomes**

The foregoing analysis of the effect of out-migration (TOTWAY) on household incomes (EARN) has been confined to the physical aspect (loss of labour). But out-migration does not only include the physical loss of household members. There is also the integral aspect of remittances (Chanda, 1985; Rempel and Lobdell, 1977). Remittances refer to the sending by urban migrants of cash and gifts in kind to their home areas. Studies made elsewhere have shown that remittances may help to raise rural incomes and consumption, increase productive investment in agriculture and may be used to relieve poverty (Oberai and Singh, 1980; Chanda, 1985).
The results of this study substantiate most of the conclusions cited in the foregoing paragraph though there is little evidence that urban to rural remittances have been a significant means of raising rural incomes.

Table 5.7 for example shows the annual household incomes of the respective sample clusters and the net increases arising from remittances. Apart from the net increases recorded in all the sample clusters, note from the same table that the proportion and amount of remittances is inversely related to the annual incomes of the sample clusters. While "low income" settlements like Chitimukulu receive proportionately larger amounts of remittances, "high income" settlements like Mumba receive comparatively smaller amounts of remittances. Furthermore, when Table 5.8 is examined, it will be seen that of the minority of households that received remittances (28 percent), there were more "low income" households (31 percent) that received remittances, compared to 20 percent from the "high income" households. Although this difference was not statistically significant using a Chi-Square test \( \chi^2 = 1.74, \text{df}=1, p=.187>.05, .01 \) this and the foregoing example suggests that remittances help to relieve the poverty of the "low income" households and, or settlements. This is particularly evident when the use to which remittances are put is examined (Appendix 5.3). There it will be seen that much of the remittance income is used for
household consumption thus helping to relieve the poverty of some households particularly the "low-income" households.

However, as noted earlier, although remittances help to compensate for the physical loss of household members by supplementing the household incomes of those who remain, their effect in raising rural incomes is not significant. This is in part indicated by the variation in total household income (TOTEARN) that is explained by total annual remittances (AVREMA). For example when the coefficient of determination ($Z^2 = .00842$) from the correlation between total household income (TOTEARN) and the total annual remittances (AVREMA) ($R^2 = .0918$, see Table 5.5 B) is examined, the results suggest that remittances explain only .8 percent of the variation in total household incomes. Even when the "low-income" households (LINCOME) receiving "large" amounts of remittances (HAVREM) are singled out the relationship between amounts to remittances received (HAVREM) and total households earnings (LINCOME) is not statistically significant though the variation in household incomes that is explained by remittances is higher (9%) ($r^2 = .3059$, $R^2 = .0936$, see Table 5.9).
Table 5.7 Effect of remittances on rural incomes (Kwacha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Household earnings per year (EARN)</th>
<th>Total remittances received per year (AVREMA)</th>
<th>Total household earnings per year (TOTEARN)</th>
<th>Net increase/proportion of total earnings due to remittances %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>40,965</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>45,395</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>90,436</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>90,866</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>78,760</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>82,950</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>49,166</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>52,196</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages (TOTAL)</td>
<td>259,327</td>
<td>12,080</td>
<td>271,407</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Table 5.8 Percentage of households receiving and not receiving remittances by village and household type a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Household type</th>
<th>Households receiving remittances</th>
<th>Households not receiving remittances</th>
<th>Total number of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High income</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All households</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Income Level</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>High Income</td>
<td>All Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High income</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All households</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High income</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All households</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High income</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All households</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High income</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All households</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Households with an annual income K2000.00 and above are called "high income" households. Those with an annual income below K2000.00 are called "low income" households.

Source: Field data

The limited impact of remittances in raising or explaining households earnings is explained by the fact that the amount of remittances received were really small. For example the average amount of remittances received per year was K93.00. When the latter
is divided by 12, it gives an average of about K8.00 per month which was just enough to buy one tablet of soap at the prices prevalent at the time of the survey.

Since the amount of remittances received are not large enough to compensate for the physical loss of household members, the net effect of out-migration (TOTWAY) is a reduction in household incomes (TOTEARN). This is indicated by the negative coefficient between out-migration (TOTWAY) and total household earnings (TOTERAN), see Table 5.5B. This means that in the sample clusters as a whole, the effect of out-migration even when remittances are taken into account is to reduce household incomes. An examination of the strength of the coefficient however, once more reveals a weak relationship between out-migration (TOTWAY) and total household earnings (TOTEARN). The coefficient obtained was $R^2 = -.1154$ giving a coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.013$ which simply means that out-migration still explains only 1.3% of the variation in household incomes.

In a way, this weak and statistically insignificant relationship between out-migration (TOTWAY) and total household earnings (TOTEARN) can be expected on account of the low-migration rates in the sample clusters. It is interesting to note from the table in Appendix 5.3 that 70 percent of the households in the sample clusters as a whole had "low out-migration rates." Since the average number of absent adult members was one, this simply means that 70 percent of the
households in the whole sample had on average one adult household member absent. Given such low rates of out-migration, out-migration can hardly be expected to have any significant effect on household incomes. Similarly remittances can hardly be expected to have any significant effect on household incomes when only 38 percent of the households received remittances and when the amounts involved were so small.

From the foregoing, it is apparent that although out-migration to urban areas is associated with a decline in household incomes as suggested by the negative coefficients between out-migration and household incomes, the decline if any is so small to be of any significance. As noted earlier this could be expected on account of the low out-migration rates. On the basis of these findings alone it seems reasonable to reject the hypothesis that out-migration reduces household incomes. The fact that out-migration explains less than 3 per cent of the variation in household incomes, means that other factors besides out-migration may be more important in explaining variations including the decline in household incomes.

Variations in the effect of out-migration on household incomes

As indicated earlier in the text, the foregoing analysis and conclusion refers to the whole sample and not the respective sample clusters. Hence the conclusions arrived at are valid only with reference to the whole sample. As Silk (1979:208) has
pointed out, relationships holding at one level of analysis may bear little resemblance to those revealed at another. An examination of Tables 5.5A and B for example, reveals that there are variations in the form of relationship between out-migration and household incomes in the sample clusters although in all cases the relationships are not statistically significant. An examination of the coefficients shows for example that, in Mumba and Chitimukulu out-migration is positively related to household incomes suggesting that in these areas out-migration results in increased rather than reduced incomes. In contrast Nseluka and Kanyanta have negative coefficients suggesting that out-migration results in reduced incomes.

The limited sample size at the village (sample cluster) level does not allow a meaningful disaggregation of the data so as to account for the aforementioned spatial variations in the relationships between out-migration and household incomes. Hence in the subsequent paragraphs reference to the sample clusters will only be made in passing as the regression residuals are examined in order to reveal the most important characteristic of the relationship between out-migration and household incomes which was not revealed in the earlier analysis. Figure 5.1A is a standardised residual plot provided by the regression of
Fig 5.1A: Standardised residual Plot - Household income (TOTEARN) residuals against expected values of y

Source: Field Data
Fig. 5.1B: Standardised residual Plot "High income" Household income (HINCOME) residuals against expected values of $y$.
household incomes (TOTEARN) on out-migration (TOTWAY). The residual values obtained from the equations (Table 5.6) are plotted on the vertical axis, and the expected Y values along the horizontal axis.

**Effect of out-migration on "Low income" households**

When figure 5.1 A is examined it will be seen that at "low income" levels (below 25) there are a lot of residuals lying below the regression line. These are called negative residuals suggesting that the regression model overestimates the effect of out-migration on "low income" households. To verify this finding, "low income" households having high out-migration rates (HMIG) were singled out and a simple correlation performed between out-migration (HMIG) and household income (LINCOME). The result revealed a positive correlation between out-migration (HMIG) and household incomes (LINCOME), (see Table 5.9). This means that in the study areas as a whole, "low income" households having more than one household member absent, benefitted from increased rather than reduced incomes. The coefficient was however, weak (r=.1141) and not significant at both the .01 and .05 significance levels (P=.311 > .01, .05).

What is of interest from the preceding finding is that one of the sample clusters, Chinimikulu, which had many "low income" households and lowest overall incomes, also had a positive relationship between out-migration (TOTWAY) and total
households incomes (TOTEARN) (see Table 5.5B). There are reasons why out-migration should result in increased rather than reduced household incomes in "low income" households or settlements like Chitimukulu.

To begin with, not only do most migrants come from "low income" households (see Appendix 5.3), the information in Appendix 5.2 further shows that sample clusters with many "low income" households like Chitimukulu have relatively more migrants that leave the village in search of a cash income (employment reasons). Once such migrants have found a job in town they seem more likely to send some cash and gifts (remittances) back home, than their counterparts from "high income" households. This was clearly demonstrated in one of the earlier paragraphs where it was shown that more "low income" households receive cash (remittances). It was further shown that in "low income" households remittances explain about 9 percent of the variation in household income, which is not very different from the percentage of total incomes, that is due to remittances in one of the sample clusters, Chitimukulu (see Table 5.7).

Hence, although "low income" households experience some hardships arising from reduced labour due to out-migration, in monetary terms they benefit from the money that the absent members send back home. It would appear that for "low income" households migration is also beneficial because if some household members did not leave the households, this would mean more mouth's to feed thus worsening the poverty. This is indicated in part by the negative coefficient between large family size (HTOTHOU) and household income
(LINCOME), (see Table 5.9). Though not statistically significant, the negative coefficient suggests that in "low income" households the larger the family size (HTOTHOU) the lower will be the household income (LINCOME) (see Table 5.9). Note from the same table that for "high income" households, large family size (HTOTHOU) is positively related to household income (HINCOME).

Table 5.9  Pearson correlation coefficient across villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIMG</th>
<th>LINCOME</th>
<th>HINCOME</th>
<th>HAVREEM</th>
<th>HTOTHOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIMG</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINCOME</td>
<td>.1141</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINCOME</td>
<td>-.6094</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12)*</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVREEM</td>
<td>.2419</td>
<td>.3095</td>
<td>-.4240</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTOTHOU</td>
<td>-.5011</td>
<td>-.5857</td>
<td>.5837</td>
<td>-.4504</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.048**</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to interpretation of figures

1. The first value i.e between HTOTHOU and HIMG=.5011 is the coefficient.

2. The number in brackets indicates the number of cases used excluding missing values.

3. P stands for the probability of the relationship having occurred by chance. Relationship is significant if P <.01 or P < .05.

4. In all cases 1 tailed test.

5. Significant relationship is indicated by * at .01, and ** at .05 significance level.

Source: Field data
Effect of out-migration on "high income" households

Turning back to the residual plot (Fig 5.1 A), it will be seen that at income levels above the bottom quarter there are a lot of residuals lying above the regression line. These are called positive residuals suggesting that the regression model underestimates the effect of out-migration on "high income" households. This simply means that out-migration accounts for more variation in the incomes of "high income" households than 1.3% predicted by the model. To verify this finding, "high income" households having "high out-migration rates" were singled out and a simple correlation done between out-migration (HMIG) and household income (HINCOME). The result was a negative correlation ($r = -0.6094$) which was significant at the .05 significance level ($P = 0.018 < .05$) (see Table 5.9). Furthermore an examination of the coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.3714$) revealed that in "high income" households having "high migration rates", out-migration explained about 37 percent of the variation in household incomes. Further examination of residuals (Fig. 5.1B) shows that this time there is no significant underestimation or overestimation. This means that it can be concluded with confidence that in the study areas the few "high income" households that had more than one household member absent suffered a decline in household incomes.
Why should "high income" households experience a decline in household income due to out-migration when "low income" households gained from the same? The survey results helped to shed some light on this question.

Firstly, as has already been demonstrated, "high income" households did not benefit as much from remittances as did "low income" households.

Secondly, it was earlier mentioned that most migrants came from "low income" households. As a result of fewer migrants leaving the "high income" households, "the high income households" had large family sizes compared to the "low income households" (see Appendix 5.3). General experience, observations made in the field and observations made by others (Sinkala, 1983:97) have shown that those with large families very much depend on their own members of the household for labour. For such families out-migration is very likely to affect farming and other cash earning and related jobs.

To summarise, an examination of residuals and disaggregation of respondents into "low income" and "high income" households having "high out-migration rates" shows that: out-migration from "low income" households resulted in increased rather than reduced incomes though the increase was not a significant one. On the other hand out-migration from "high income" households resulted in a significant decline in household
incomes. The foregoing observations however, apply to only a few "low income" and "high income" households that had "high out-migration rates". In other words these findings do not affect the earlier conclusion on the postulated hypothesis, that out-migration had no significant effect on household incomes. Hence the residual results merely suggest that given high rates of out-migration from households, "high income" households are more likely to be negatively affected than will the "low income" households.

Summary, conclusion and suggestions for further research

The purpose of this section was to investigate whether out-migration to urban areas reduces the incomes of affected households thereby reducing the market for village industries. The findings show that out-migration had no significant effect on household income on account of low out-migration rates in the sample clusters. An examination of residuals and other statistical findings suggests that given high out-migration rates, particularly of adult members, "high income" households are more likely to suffer a decline in household incomes than would the low income households.

These findings however, need to be treated with caution. Although it has been consistently indicated that out-migration is the cause of the decline or increase in household incomes, no cause and effect appears warranted. As Zaslavskaia and Liashenko (1976:65) once pointed out, under consideration here is a system
whose elements are closely inter-connected rather than a set of relatively independent parts. While declining incomes may be a result of out-migration it is equally likely that out-migration may be due to low household incomes. This could perhaps explain why in the study areas "low income" households which had more absent members had small family sizes but more dependent children, while "high income" households which had fewer migrants had large family sizes (see Appendix 5.3). It may well explain why in one of the sample clusters, Mumba, the out-migration rates were very low (Table 5.1). There the low out-migration rates seem to be due to the high household incomes (Table 5.7) which made it unnecessary for many migrants to migrate particularly for a cash income and related reasons (see Appendix 5.2).

Furthermore, even after disaggregating "low income" and "high income" households into those having "high out-migration rates" the variation in household incomes that is explained by out-migration is no more than 40 percent. This leaves a lot still unexplained. It does seem likely that additional influences on both out-migration and household incomes for example, the worsening economic situation in Zambia could be responsible for both the decline in rural household incomes and out-migration. In this regard out-migration could principally be a consequence of the decline in household incomes rather than the cause.
In order to outline the relationship between out-migration and household incomes, it requires that one obtains estimates of rural incomes disaggregated by age, sex, education, attitudes and access to productive factors on the part of both migrants and non-households heads. This kind of information would enable one to make a proper analysis of the relationship between out-migration and household incomes. Unfortunately limited information and particularly the sample size could not permit such a detailed analysis. It is the hope of this researcher that future researchers on this aspect will take note of the observations mentioned above.

Despite the limitations pointed out in the foregoing paragraph and despite the apparent complexity of the relationship between out-migration and household incomes, it can be concluded that in the study areas the absence of migrants (out-migration) as part of household labour had no significant effect on household incomes. This means that in the study areas, out-migration did not affect rural production, particularly cash incomes, whose reduction implies a contraction of the market for the products of village industries. In addition to the foregoing conclusion it can be generalised that, if the decline in rural-urban migration rates reported in the rural provinces of Zambia (Chilivumbo 1980; SATEP ILO report, 1985; C.S.O, 1985) continues, it means out-migration to urban areas does not and
will not, in the foreseeable future, constitute a threat to the market for the products of village industries in the rural areas of Zambia.

5.4 Do migrants bring or send back capital whose investment promotes the formation and prosperity of village industries?

The initial assumption was that remittances of cash income to rural areas and cash savings by migrants while in town provide the necessary capital that is used to establish village industries when the migrants return to their home areas.

Survey results

The importance of remittances in raising rural incomes was noted in section 5.3 where it was demonstrated that remittances had no significant influence in raising rural incomes. The survey results subsequently show that remittances play no part in providing the capital needed to put up village industries. Not only are the amounts involved small as indicated in section 5.3, it was also indicated that the little amounts that are received are mostly used for consumption and not invested in village industries.

In addition to the observations made in the foregoing paragraph, all village industry entrepreneurs interviewed indicated that they did not receive any remittances. In a way this is to be expected considering that it is mostly the "poorer" or "low income" households that receive
remittances (see section 5.3). Entrepreneurs on the other hand can be said to be comparatively well off, since they have at least some "extra" income to invest in village industries.

From the foregoing, it is apparent that the findings do not support part of the hypothesis to be restated and tested, which states that: remittances help to provide the capital needed to establish village industries.

While remittances play no part in providing the initial capital needed to establish village industries, cash savings by migrants while in urban areas provided the main source of capital for the private village industries found in the sample clusters. It will be seen from Table 5.10 that the majority of entrepreneurs (54%) indicated their source of capital as savings made while in urban areas. Forty-six percent indicated their source of capital as grants from institutions. The latter refers to the village industries funded by the Village Industry Service (VIS) and the Village Development Foundation (VDF). If, however, the institutionally funded projects are excluded it is interesting to point out that all the private and individually funded projects (village industries) derived their initial capital from savings made by migrants while they were in urban areas.

To a great extent the foregoing paragraph limited opportunities for earning cash incomes in the villages, As Gugler (1969) has pointed out, opportunities for earning high
incomes in rural areas are very limited. In the sample clusters covered by this study, the problem of cash incomes seems to have been worsened by the limited role played by the "local" commercial banks in funding village industries. This is clearly evident from Table 5.10. This has serious policy implications. Mention was made in section 5.2 of the limited role played by young men and women in village industries. The limited opportunities for earning cash incomes or obtaining loans from commercial banks may in part explain why there were no "young" village industry entreprenuers in the sample clusters. In this respect migration may be said to be beneficial since it helps the rural population to overcome the cash bottlenecks in their bid to put up village industries and other ventures.

To summarise, the findings show that while remittances played no part in providing the capital needed to establish village industries, cash savings by migrants while in urban areas constituted the major source of capital that was used to put up village industries.

The postulated hypothesis was that remittances and cash savings made in urban areas constitute the major source of capital for village industries. The evidence from the survey shows that savings made in urban areas constitute the main source of capital as postulated, but any conclusion on the hypothesis
is weakened by the fact that remittances play no part in providing the necessary capital. Hence the hypothesis is neither disproved nor is it proved correct, since the part on cash savings is correct while that on remittances is not.

Table 5.10 Sources of cash used to establish village industries (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of capital</th>
<th>Percentage of entrepreneurs n=13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money saved while in town</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash savings within village</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan from commercial bank</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant from institution</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of entrepreneurs</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

5.5 Are migrants more active in village industries than non-migrants?

This section outlines the findings which were used to test the hypothesis that: return migrants participate more in village industries than non-migrants. Initially it was expected that more migrants than non-migrants would participate in village industries both as entrepreneurs as well as employees.

Statistical findings

Table 5.11 shows the percentage of village industry entrepreneurs who are returned migrants and those who had never
migrated to urban areas. It will be seen from the table that, as was earlier postulated, there were more migrant entrepreneurs (69%) compared to non-migrants (31%). This difference in the numbers of entrepreneurs was statistically significant at the .10 significance level using a Binomial test (see Appendix 5.5 for details on calculations). Furthermore when institutionally funded projects mentioned in the last section were excluded, it was observed that all private and individually owned village industries were owned by return migrants. This finding supports not only the postulated hypothesis, it also confirms the earlier stated findings and observation by scholars such as Chanda (1985) and Chilivumbo (1980) (see chapter 4). On the basis of these findings and similar findings by other scholars referred to above, it seems reasonable to accept part of the hypothesis which states that: more return - migrants than non-migrants participate in village industries as entrepreneurs.

The foregoing conclusion, however, refers to the return - migrants participation as entrepreneurs of village industries. As indicated earlier, interest was also in finding out if more return - migrants than non-migrants would participate in village industries as employees. Unfortunately the study made no attempt to find out how many village industry employees were return - migrants and non-migrants on account of the limited number of village industries as well as employees, contrary to what was initially expected. If anything, however, it seems return
migrants are the least likely to participate as employees of village industries. This is because migrants, particularly those with village based aspirations, migrate in order to raise cash to come and put up their own village industries, groceries, small farms and other ventures, rather than migrating to come and work for someone again (see chapter 6). In addition advanced age for most of them and fear of loss of social prestige makes them unlikely candidates as "potential" employees for village industries.

Table : 5.11 Village industry entrepreneurship. A comparison between migrants and non-migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of entrepreneur</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of entrepreneurs 100

Source: Field data

5.6 Do migrants bring back skills which are of use in the development of village industries?

Having established that more return-migrants than non-migrants participate in village industries as entrepreneurs, it is of great importance to prod further to examine the nature of skills the return-migrants bring with them. This is of great importance particularly for the government and various
organisations concerned with promoting various kinds of village industries in rural areas. This is because the future development of village industries will depend among other things upon the extent to which various local skills will be exploited.

The finding across villages is that there were relatively more return-migrants who had acquired some worthwhile skills in urban areas than the proportion of return migrants who did not. According to Table 5.12, for example, about 44 percent of the return migrants indicated that they had, while a way, acquired skills which were useful in the village compared to 31% who indicated that they had not acquired any worthwhile skills. Note from the table that in some clusters such as Chitimukulu the percentage regarding themselves as having acquired some worthwhile skills is as high as 74%. The smaller percentage regarding themselves as having acquired some worthwhile skills in Mumba, Nseluka and Kanyanta is worthy of attention. For Mumba and Kanyanta the latter observation can be explained in part by the fact that these two villages had comparatively more people that had migrated for short periods of time (see Appendix 5.6) to have acquired any worthwhile skills. For Nseluka the explanation is that the sample cluster had comparatively more people that had migrated for reasons of marriage (see Appendix 5.6). The latter were in most cases women migrating to join their husbands in towns. Traditionally, since most women in the past have
merely been housewives it is unlikely that they could have acquired some worthwhile skills, compared to professionally trained women.

Table 5.13 shows the type of skills acquired by those return-migrants that claimed to have acquired some worthwhile skills. According to the table, the majority (61%) indicated technical skills followed by 22% who indicated leadership skills. This was followed by 9 percent who indicated some business skills or the ability to run a business concern. Only 4 percent indicated having acquired some education and a mixture of leadership and technical skills respectively.

Technical skills were taken to include the ability to perform such jobs as carpentry, tailoring, shoemaking - mending, radio repair, tinsmithing, basket making, welding as well as the ability to use new and improved methods of farming. Leadership skills were defined as the ability to participate and have positions of responsibility in various community organisations such as those found in schools, churches, the then ruling party (UNIP) as well as co-operatives. Education was also considered a useful skill vis-a-vis the development of village industries because education particularly higher levels of education may help someone to comprehend an innovation and its value to them (Sinkala, 1983:90). As Sinkala (1983) went further to point out, education may change people's attitudes and values especially by reducing traditional values and making people more prepared to
adopt new ideas. The importance of education in relation to village industry entrepreneurship is clearly demonstrated in Figure 5.2 where it will be seen that the level of education of village industry entrepreneurs is higher than that for the other villagers. The latter finding has been documented by other writers (Liedholm, 1973; Liedholm and Chuta, 1975, 1976).

Tables 5.14 to 5.16 show the return-migrants participation in various activities: local semi-skilled or skilled employment; cash crop farming; and, other non-agricultural business before and after migration. Semi or skilled employment refers to those that engaged in activities such as carpentry, bricklaying, tailoring and various kinds of repair work. Non-agricultural business refers to activities such as fishing, operating a grocery, bar or hammermills. In all cases outlined above the tables suggest that there were far more returnee men first taking up the aforementioned activities after return and not before migration. The latter findings suggest that migrants to towns benefit not only by acquiring skills directly related to village industries such as carpentry, tailoring and bricklaying, they also acquire indirect skills the most important being what Chanda (1985:128) describes as a greater appreciation of cash economics and its associated benefits than the typical villager. The latter skill is what was referred to as a business skill earlier in the section.
Table 5.12 Return migrants: Percentage regarding themselves as having acquired, or not acquired, while away, skills useful in the village (Percent of total return migrants). a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Percentage acquiring useful skills</th>
<th>Percentage without useful skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a There were a total of 52 return migrants in the whole sample (see Appendix 5.6).

Source: Field data

Table 5.13 Type of skills acquired by return migrants while in urban areas. (Percent of total number of migrants that claimed to have acquired some skills useful in the village) a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Type of Skills</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Technical and leadership</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a There were 23 (44%) migrants who claimed to have acquired some skills useful in the village (see Appendix 5.6).

Source: Field data
Table 5.14 Return migrants: Involvement in local semi-skilled or skilled employment before or after migration (Percentage of total number of return-migrants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Both but with significant improvement</th>
<th>Both but with no significant improvement</th>
<th>No reply</th>
<th>Total number of return migrants n= 52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Table 5.15 Return migrants: Involvement in cash crop growing before and after migration (Percent of total number of return migrants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Both but with significant improvement</th>
<th>Both but with no significant improvement</th>
<th>No reply</th>
<th>Total number of return migrants n= 52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
Fig. 5.2: Formal Education and village industry entrepreneurship

Source: Field Data
Unfortunately, most of the enterprises failed after a few years of their inception. Other scholars have noted a similar development in relation to various kinds of projects by return-migrants in rural areas (King, 1978; King and Strachan, 1980).

A number of factors account for the failure of projects by return-migrants, but the most important factor seems to be that outlined by King (1978:178) who argued that most projects by return-migrants fail because most rural areas that they invest in are of doubtful economic viability and lacking in infrastructure. As will be shown and explained in the subsequent chapters, findings of this study support King's argument. Conditions in the sample clusters did not seem conducive to the establishment and development of village industries. For example, among the constraints highlighted by the return-migrants were the lack of transport, raw materials, and limited market. The latter problems were compounded by limitation of funds. This is evident from the examination of Table 6.6 where it will be seen that only 10 percent of the return migrants claimed to have acquired enough capital. To this can be added another 19 percent that had got their pension.

The foregoing paragraphs explain why there were not as many village industries as the number of return migrants that claimed to have acquired some skills or having established some kind of village industry upon return.
Discussion

The beneficial impact of return migration to village industries in terms of skill acquisition is fairly clear. It is evident that village industries benefit from the ideas and skills which the migrants acquire while in urban areas. For example, some of the skills acquired by return migrants in the sample clusters included those pertaining to carpentry, tailoring, brickmaking, laying, radio and shoe repair and plumbing. This acquisition of skills for small rural industries has been documented by other scholars (Liedholm and Chuta, 1976:59). In addition to the afore mentioned skills, there were other indirect skills which are beneficial to the development of village industries. One of them is the return-migrants participation in commercial agriculture (see Table 5.15). If agriculture is developed it could provide most of the raw materials needed to sustain some village industries. Examples include: grain milling (maize, rice, sorghum, wheat, etc); oil from seed, drying and canning fruits and vegetables etc. Another indirect and perhaps more important but less obvious skill is the return-migrants appreciation of cash economy and his associated ability to engage in and undertake business risks than the typical villager (Chanda, 1985).
A number of writers (King 1978:79; Simons et al., 1984:85) have argued that return migrants contribute little in terms of skills, because most of the skills acquired in urban areas are of little use in the village. Findings of this study do not support this observation and instead show that most migrants had acquired skills which could be exploited in the villages. For example, apart from the more obvious skills such as carpentry, tailoring, tin smithing, shoe and radio repair and plumbing, some returnee men claimed to have worked as clerical officers while one respondent in Nseluka claimed to have worked as cook in a hotel. Clearly a cook or clerical officer could contribute to the development of village industries given favourable opportunities. For example, various community organisations need people to keep records of plans, projects executed and finances. Similarly a person who has worked as a cook in town would be a great asset in small village bakeries processing local grain. In addition to the afore mentioned skills others claimed to have acquired more education. The importance of education to village industries is fairly obvious especially when Figure 5.2 is examined.

Hence to conclude that the various skills outlined in the last paragraph have little use in the village would require justification on what is, and what is not a useful skill. Most of the skills outlined earlier may appear to be of little value
because most rural areas in Zambia including the sample clusters offer limited opportunities for the exploitation of various skills acquired by return migrants. For example, in the sample clusters the only industry which was widespread and which appeared to be economically viable was farming. Farming is viable because of the various credit and marketing facilities which have been instituted by the government to stimulate agricultural production in the country.

In conclusion it can be pointed out that a number of return-migrants, though not all, do bring with them some worthwhile skills which various concerned organisations could exploit in their efforts to promote village industries in the rural areas.

5.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter sought to investigate the effect of rural-urban migration on village industries.

The most outstanding feature in the sample clusters covered by this study were the low rates of out-migration. Only 18 percent of the adult household members were absent or had migrated to urban areas. This figure (18%) is surprisingly low when compared to the period immediately after independence when out-migration rates were reported to be as high as 77 percent. As a result of the decline in rural-urban migration rates, 70 percent of the households in the sample clusters had, on average, only one adult member absent.
As a result of the low-migration rates, the sample clusters had an abundant supply of under utilised labour. Consequently labour shortages for village industries were unheard of. Similarly, because of the low-out-migration rates, out-migration had no significant influence on household incomes. The evidence emerging from the survey, however suggests that high-out-migration rates may lead to a decline in household income, particularly in high income households.

A number of migrants send back to their home areas some cash and gifts (remittances). The value of remittances is, however, relatively small and unlikely to contribute significantly to the capital accumulation needed to put up village industries. A number of return-migrants do, however, bring back home cash savings which they use to put up a number of enterprises and village industries, including all the privately owned village industries which were in operation at the time of the survey.

In addition to the cash savings, a number of return-migrants acquire a variety of ideas and skills which enable them to put up tailoring, tin-smith shops and other small industries. Unfortunately most of the projects fail sooner or later because of unfavourable economic conditions in the rural areas. For a number of other return-migrants, limitation of funds prevents them from putting up various kinds of enterprises including village industries.
5.8 CONCLUSION

Based on the evidence from the survey, it can be concluded that rural settlements benefit rather than suffer as a result of rural-urban migration. Apart from the benefits outlined above, out-migration of dependent adult household members helps to relieve the pressure not only on the limited sources of employment but also on the meager household incomes especially amongst the low income household. In any case the evidence emerging from the survey suggests that even if the young migrants did not migrate, they would be the least likely to participate in the kind of village industries found in the sample clusters. It is apparent from the afore-going that the pessimistic view of the impact of rural-urban migration on the rural places of origin, as advanced by some researchers and policy makers alike, presents an over simplified picture. Rural-urban migration may have been detrimental in the past when out-migration rates were high and when out-migration included heads of households. That era is over, and it is time people adopted a fresh look at the rural-urban migration process.
CHAPTER 6

IMPACT OF VILLAGE INDUSTRIES ON MIGRATION

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents findings on the extent to which village industries in the sample clusters have helped to achieve the government's goals of:

(i) providing wage employment to the rural population;
(ii) improving the living conditions of the rural population;
(iii) reducing rural-urban migration, as well as,
(iv) encouraging the return of migrants to the villages.

These objectives are interlinked. For example, availability of local sources of wage employment can help to reduce rural-urban migration since the need for paid employment has been identified implicitly as one of the chief push factors in rural-urban migration (Todaro, 1971:391; Jackman 1973:59 Clunies Ross, 1984:142). At the same time availability of wage jobs in rural areas can act as a pull for both rural and urban residents in need of such jobs. Subsequently, availability of such wage income sources in rural areas would lead to improved living conditions which would further attract more people to these areas. As Zaslavskaiia and Liashenko (1976:70) concluded from their study of rural settlements, socially and economically advanced settlements possess an ability to attract population whereas comparatively backward settlements lose people. Hence
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although the focus of this study is on village industries and migration its findings are relevant to the national objects stated above.

In relating the field data to the outlined objectives, emphasis will be placed on testing the hypothesis outlined in chapter four. These are restated in the text to ensure continuity in the presentation and analysis of data.

Because of the limited number and sizes of village industries in the sample clusters, it has not been possible to use most statistical analysis and tests in respect of both the hypothesis and the impact of village industries. Hence the subsequent analysis of data is essentially descriptive.

6.1. General findings

The salient feature about the sample clusters is the limited number of village industries contrary to the impression one would get from the available literature on this subject. This does not mean people in the sample clusters are not involved in any kind of small enterprises. There were a number of petty and temporary enterprises, the most common being beer brewing and sale of products like cigarettes soap and sugar at inflated prices. But these kinds of enterprises do not tally with those that the government policy makers and planners regard as strategic to Zambia's rural socio-economic development.

For example, when the government formed the Village Industry Service (VIS) in 1980, the organisation was charged with the responsibility of promoting small village based industries in three sectors, namely: food processing; wood and textile processing; and metal work and chemical processing (Dall, 1980:52)

A review of proposed industries in these sectors, and indeed other government documents like the Third National Development Plan (TNDP) or newspaper publications such as the Zambia Daily Mail (10, 19 and 24 August 1987 and 21 March 1988) will show that the former kind of enterprises are not mentioned nor are they in line with government policy. While the former kind of enterprises are numerous those envisaged by the government are very few as is evident from Table 6.1. Table 6.1 shows the magnitude and types of village industries in the sample clusters. According to the table, there were only 13 village industries in the combined sample clusters. Most of the village industries were concentrated in one sample cluster, Chitimukulu,

2. The organisation promotes village industries by: providing advice on how to set up a unit; project design and development; marketing; supply of raw materials; financing and credit etc. It is dependent upon annual grants from the government and Foreign Missions for its operations (VIS Pamphlet)

3. For a list of proposed industries under each sector the reader is referred to Appendix 6.1
which had six. These figures are surprisingly low considering that the villages were not randomly selected, instead the sample clusters were those that by local standards had many village industries.

Table 6.1 Distribution and type of village industry by sample cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample cluster</th>
<th>Number of establishments</th>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Funding institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Carpentry (1)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maize mill (4)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soap making (1)</td>
<td>VIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carpentry (1)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soap making (1)</td>
<td>VIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carpentry (1)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soap making (1)</td>
<td>VIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carpentry (1)</td>
<td>VDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maize mill (1)</td>
<td>VDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Economics (1)</td>
<td>VDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All villages</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

6.2 Village industries in the sample clusters

Some characteristics of village industries in the sample clusters should be mentioned in order that the subsequent data analysis and conclusions may be understood in relation to the goals envisaged by the government.
6.2. Maize mills in Chitimukulu

There were four maize mills in Chitimukulu. All the mills were owned by private individuals. As was expected the entrepreneurs were all return migrants.

Although Chitimukulu had many mills, this had not solved the problem of mealie meal in the community. Mealie meal was still a scarce commodity and people had to travel long distances to the district centre to buy the commodity.

In large part, the scarcity of mealie meal was due to the shortage of the raw material, maize. This in turn could be attributed to a number of factors. Firstly, most of the village cultivators are subsistence farmers producing only enough for home consumption. Secondly, in this area (Northern Province) people have traditionally cultivated finger millet as the main crop (Musampa, 1986:187-88). Hence a number of families still devote most of their fields to finger millet. Thirdly, there were a few farmers who grew some maize for sale, but much of the produce went into the repayment of seasonal loans either to the Northern Province Co-operative Union (NCU) or to a private organisation called "Cinchi wa babili" which is based in Malole some thirteen kilometres from Chitimukulu. Hence it was not common to find a household which produced say 10 bags of maize forfeiting seven or even more bags as loan repayment.

In addition to the lack of surplus local maize, the
government pricing system at the time of the survey made it difficult for the local millers to buy locally produced maize even if it were available. At the time of the survey, for example, the producer price for a 90 kilogram bag of maize was K78.00. This is the price a local farmer was paid for a bag of maize. When a 90 kilogram bag was bought and processed by the millers and the mealie meal sold at the official government price there was a loss of K22.00 per every 90 kilogram bag that was used.

For large millers with a manufacturing licence the deficit was subsidized by the government. But small hammer mills such as those found in Chitimukulu were often not covered by this arrangement. Interviews with officials at the Small Industries Development Organisation (SIDO) in Kasama revealed that even if the small millers wanted to get a manufacturing licence, the process was long and difficult especially in remote areas. As a result the small hammer mills were unable to get maize allocations which were only issued by the National Contingency Committee which was based in the capital city.

As a result of the constraints outlined above, the hammer mills in Chitimukulu did not operate at full capacity. The entrepreneurs could not process maize for sale. They were instead confined to providing a service by grinding the grain which the local residents brought and for which they are charged a fee. Since the availability of such maize was often erratic in
the village, so too were the operations of the hammer mills.

The labour used in the mills consisted of either the owner or unpaid family labour or a combination of the two. Hence the hammer mills in Chitimukulu did not contribute much to the wage employment needs of the community.

6.2.2 Carpentry enterprises

The carpentry enterprises were really small open air affairs. The only indication of carpentry work was the sawdust and a saw-horse consisting of two poles joined by a flat plank. The amount of physical capital was quite small and consisted mainly of a few tools.

Unlike the millers the carpenters had no difficulties in procuring the timber as this was often brought by the local sawyers. No attempt was made to find out whether the sawyers had difficulties in finding the timber considering that a licence has to be obtained before certain kinds of trees can be cut (Musampa, 1986:176).

Production was erratic as there were often periods of time when there was no production. Sometimes this was due to lack of capital for buying raw materials such as timber, nails and glue. But, in large part, this was due to limited local market. While demand did exist for small items like stools and chairs, demand for bigger items like beds and dining tables was often limited. As a result the carpenters often withheld production until orders were received, either locally or from outside the village.
The carpenters were asked whether or not there were plans to expand their operations. In most cases the constraint of funds particularly for purchasing tools was mentioned. From the observations made by this researcher, it would appear that expansion would only lead to reduced incomes since the local markets were not large enough to enable them cover the increased production costs as a result of expansion. As Milimo (1987) has pointed out, carpentry shops require large concentrations of populations to enable them find markets for their products.

The labour used in carpentry enterprises comprised only owners. Hence the carpentry enterprises like the maize mills did not contribute much to the employment needs of the local community.

The foregoing description and conclusion refer to the carpentry enterprises owned by private individuals. It does not include the carpentry workshop in Kanyanta which is funded by the VDF.

6.2.3 Soap making

The soap making enterprises were found in three of the sample clusters. Only one sample cluster, Kanyanta, did not have this kind of enterprise. These ventures were run on a co-operative basis. They were each headed by a chairlady elected from among the members who were all female. Membership ranged from fifteen to twenty members.
Initially these co-operatives started as homecraft clubs in the early eighties. During that time the main activities included gardening, knitting, sewing and making foodstuffs like bread and scones. The proceeds from these ventures were reinvested into the business - the surplus being shared amongst the members. These activities particularly knitting, sewing and baking however proved to be uneconomic on account of the scarcity and rising cost of raw materials and transport. In terms of raw materials, for example, these clubs at times relied on private individuals travelling to Lusaka or the Copperbelt nearly a thousand kilometres away. For sewing and knitting products, local demand was often limited and these had to be taken to the district centre (Kasama) for sale. Gardening too was not very successful because most members were married and they had to divide their energies and time between the club and family plots. Hence the homecraft clubs operated under very difficult economic conditions.

This state of affairs continued until the VIS came to the aid of the co-operatives. This began with a seminar in 1986 in which the idea of soap making was introduced to the members of the co-operatives. During the seminar about 75 participants from various co-operatives were taught how to make soap.

The soap making project was started as a means of assisting rural based women organisations. The objective was to change such organisations to profit making organisations. The soap
making project was found to be most suitable because it did not require any special skills or formal education.

When the soap making projects were initiated the VIS assisted the co-operatives in procuring and transporting raw materials. This assistance was to continue until the various co-operatives became self sustaining.

The main raw material used in soap making is animal fat (tallow). This came from Livingstone over 1500 kilometres away. Other raw materials include caustic soda, salt, perfume and colours. None of these were obtained locally, that is, within Kasama District or anywhere in the Northern Province. They were purchased either from Lusaka or the Copperbelt.

The soap making process does not require any elaborate equipment. All that is required is a drum or large pot for cooking a mixture of the various raw materials outlined above. When the raw materials are cooked, they are transferred into wooden moulds. The end product is a bar soap, the kind that is used for washing clothes.

The annual gross income from the sale of soap ranged from K1000=00 to K3000=00. But in view of the cost of raw materials, the net income was often not enough to enable the members share some cash income. Hence rather than share the money, members would each receive a tablet of soap once a month as was the case with the Chitimukulu based co-operative.
The project soon proved to be economically non-viable. It became too costly to procure raw materials especially tallow which is very bulky and usually comes in drums. The VIS realised that the project was unsuited to the area considering that the Northern Province had traditionally not been a cattle rearing area.\textsuperscript{4} As a result of the various economic constraints outlined above, the soap making projects were almost at a standstill at the time of the survey which was less than two years since they were started. In fact only one co-operative in Mumba had some reserve supplies of tallow to last for about three months, after which the project was likely to be abandoned.

With the failure of the soap making project the members of the various co-operatives were asked to indicate alternative projects that they had planned to embark on. From the responses given it would appear that there were no concrete plans. In Chitimukulu for example, the members indicated a number of projects such as growing vegetables, buying and selling of fish and baking. In Mumba the members intended to invest their money in a grocery or some other commercial venture which they could not specify. From the observations made in the field, and, in the light of the past experience with homecraft clubs described

\textsuperscript{4} Some cattle is raised in Isoka, Chinsali and Nakonde areas, but these are not enough to sustain the industry making tallow.
earlier on, it would appear that whatever new projects the members may embark on, they will also be constrained by the same problems that afflicted the homecraft clubs and the soap making projects.

Finally it must be mentioned that the VIS in the Northern Province is not only involved in the soap making project. It also supports a carpentry workshop, food processing (baking), and tailoring, not only in the Kasama District but also in the Mpika and Luwingu districts. One pertinent observation made, however, is the predominance of tailoring and knitting which seem to be concentrated in the district centres at the expense of other projects more suitable to and most needed in the remoter villages (see chapter 7). Furthermore, 'the activities of VIS are supposed to be concentrated in the villages' (Chilivumbo, et al., 1988:15). But this objective, too, is not being adhered to.

6.2.4 Village industries in Kanyanta

The village industries in Kanyanta, namely, a maize mill, carpentry workshop and a homecraft co-operative were all conceived and instituted with the help of the VDF (see Table 6.1).

It may not be too much to provide a brief description of the organisation. For more details on the activities of VDF the reader is referred to Appendix 6.2.
The VDF is a non-governmental organisation whose activities are concentrated in the Kasama District. It is a non-profit making charitable organisation. It is internationally funded by organisations such as the Norwegian Development Agency (NORAD) and Oxfam.

The organisation has similar objectives as VIS namely, that of promoting village based small-scale industries. Initially the organisation was known as the Mungwi Village Industry Service. The name was later changed to its present one when VIS was introduced in Kasama because there was an overlap in names and goals.

With this brief background the paper will now proceed to provide a brief description of the village industries in Kanyanta.

The Kanyanta project(s) started in 1982. Apart from the village industries outlined in Table 6.1, there was also a literacy club, a pre-school and a club tuckshop. These various sections all operated from permanent structures erected on selfhelp basis with the material and financial assistance coming from the VDF. Each section maintained its own bank account.

Carpentry workshop

The carpentry workshop had ten members. The members were all young adults with ages ranging from 18 to 22 years. Their education standard ranged from none to grade ten. The club is run on a co-operative basis.
The members take part in both theory and practical lessons. The instructor is a qualified staff who is an employee of the VDF engaged on contract basis.

At the time of the survey the products from the practical lessons included; a wheelbarrow; clutches; beds and tables; brooms; moulds for brickmaking; a groundnut crusher; and, some chairs. All the products were of high quality and comparable to the products that are sold in shops in the urban centres.

Raw materials particularly wood was available locally. This was bought from the local sawyers. Hence no shortage of wood was experienced.

The market includes both the local and non-local. The latter refers to orders that are sometimes received from Kasama. The VDF sometimes assists in transporting the finished products to Kasama. This organisation plans to open a retail outlet in Mungwi, a sub district located some 9 kilometres away from Kanyanta.

As an incentive to the members of the carpentry workshop the VDF had at the time of the survey just introduced a monthly salary of K200-00. The money that came from the sale of the products was not enough to sustain these salaries. Hence, the money for the salaries was provided by the VDF. The money realised from the sales of products was put into the club account, and was only drawn when raw materials had to be bought.
The major constraint on the workshop as indicated by the chairman was that of limited tools.

In conclusion, it can be pointed out that the carpentry workshop has contributed greatly to the employment needs of the community considering that it had absorbed some of the youth who form the bulk of underutilised labour in the villages and who form the majority of people migrating to towns in search of employment. The industry has also served the community by providing goods and services which would otherwise not have been available.

Maize mill

The maize mill was operated by two employees. Both employees were local residents and received a monthly salary from the VDF.

The main activity was providing a service by grinding the maize brought by members of the local community. As in the case of the mills in Chitimukulu, the raw material (maize) was not enough to enable the mill to process and market mealie meal at the local tuckshop. The VDF planned to step up maize production so that in future mealie meal could be sold at the local tuckshop (see Appendix 6.2 for more details).

The mill had greatly benefited the local community as it had enabled families with stocks of maize to process maize locally thus saving them from travelling long distances to Mungwi and Kasama to buy mealie meal.
During the peak season from August to December the cash earnings were as much as K80=00 per day. This gives an average income of K2400=00 per month. This amount was however, not sufficient to sustain the salaries of the two employees. The money realised by the mill went to the VDF which used part of the money to purchase fuel.

In conclusion it can be pointed out that the mill had contributed greatly to the well being of the community by providing a service.

Homecraft club

The homecraft section had 13 female members. The main activities included sewing, knitting and baking. There were plans to establish gardens for coffee, soya beans and citrus fruits so that the produce could be processed locally into cakes, milk, and jams. The finished products could then be sold in the local tuckshop when it opened.

Raw materials were not available locally. These come from Kasama (cloth, wool, flour and other baking ingredients). The market for the finished products was mainly local except for knitting products and sewn clothes.

Unlike the other two industries described earlier, the section did not seem to be doing well economically. The rising costs and at times non-availability of raw material were constraining the operations of the club, as was the case with the
co-operatives funded by VIS. Hence the club’s contribution in terms of services was not very significant.

6.3 Significantly more sources of wage employment?

This section presents findings on the extent to which village industries in the sample clusters have helped to achieve the government’s goal of providing wage employment to the rural population. The postulated hypothesis was that: village industries provide significantly more sources of wage employment than other activities in the villages. The reasoning behind the hypothesised relationship has already been outlined in chapter 4.

Survey results

The most outstanding feature about the wage employment situation in general is the limited number of people who were in this sector. Table 6.2, for example, shows the percentage of heads of households who were in wage employment. According to the table, only 11 percent of the whole sample of household heads were in wage employment. In some sample clusters such as Chitimukulu and Mumba the percentage of household heads in wage employment was much lower than the aggregated results (3 and 0 percent respectively). Nseluka and Kanyanta are the only sample clusters in which the percentage in wage employment was 20 percent for each village. There the high percentage in wage employment was partly due to a number of household heads that were employed by government departments such as the schools, the
clinic and department of agriculture in the case of Nseluka, and, the department of agriculture, VDF, and private commercial farms in the case of Kanyanta.

Table 6.2 Percentage of household heads in wage employment and other economic activities by village (Percent of total sample of household heads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Economic activity of household heads</th>
<th>Total number of household heads n= 130 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Self employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Table 6.3 Percentage of households with a household member (other than the household head) in wage employment. Summary of findings by village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Households with a member in wage employment (Percent of total sampled households)</th>
<th>Household without a member in wage employment (Percent of total sampled households)</th>
<th>Total number of sampled households n=130 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
A similar picture emerges when dependent households members are considered. Table 6.3 for example, shows the percentage of households that had a member (other than the head) in wage employment. According to Table 6.3, only 10 percent of the whole sample of households had a member in wage employment.

Tables 6.4 and 6.5 show the employing organisations for the few household heads and other household members who were in wage employment respectively.

According to Table 6.4 the main employer for the few household heads in wage employment was the government and not village industries as postulated. It will be seen from the Table that there were almost three times as many household heads employed by the government (8 percent) as there were employed by village industries (3 percent). The latter percentage could have been much lower if it was not for the village industries in Kanyanta, the only ones that offered opportunities for wage employment.

A similar picture emerges when household members other than the heads of households are considered. According to table 6.5 there were more household members employed by the government (6 percent) than there were employed by village industries (4 percent). When the respective sample clusters are considered, it will again be noted that the few who were employed by village industries all came from Kanyanta.
Table 6.4 Nature of employing agency for household heads in wage employment (Percent of total sample of household heads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Employer for those in wage employment</th>
<th>not in wage employment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government/ District Council</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>non-Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu (N=30)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba (N=30)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka (N=40)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta (N=30)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages(N=130)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Table 6.5 Employing agency for dependent household members in wage employment (Percent of total number of households).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Employer for those in wage employment</th>
<th>not in wage employment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government/ Village Industrial Council</td>
<td>other non-government organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu (N=30)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba (N=30)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka (N=40)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta (N=30)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages(N=130)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
When the figures for household heads and other members in wage employment are combined the findings show that only 30 adult members were in wage employment. Out of this 30, the majority 18 (60 percent) were employed by the government, while village industries employed only (30 percent). The remaining 3 (10 percent) were employed by private organisations.

To summarise, the statistical findings show that, in the whole sample:

(i) very few people were in wage employment, and that,
(ii) of the few who were in wage employment the majority were employed by the government and not village industries as postulated.

These findings support the observations made earlier in the chapter and in the foregoing section that village industries are limited not only in the number of establishments but also in size. As a result they can offer only limited sources of employment, particularly wage employment.

5. This refers to private commercial farms in Kanyanta and Nseluka as well as non-governmental organisations such as EEC in Mumba. For example at the time of the survey EEC had just moved to Mumba to take over some projects notably rice growing and the Oxenization programme, which were left by IRDP. The programme was previously funded by NORAD.
On the basis of these results it can be generalised that in the sample clusters village industries do not provide more sources of wage employment than other sectors notably the government sector. On the basis of these results alone the hypothesis that village industries provide significantly more sources of wage employment than other activities in the village is rejected.

Discussion

From the description of various village industries in the sample clusters (section 6.2) and from the findings presented in this section, the impact of village industries in terms of providing wage employment is fairly clear.

The findings highlight not only the limited sources of wage employment in the villages but also the limited impact of village industries in catering for the wage employment needs of the rural population. The latter is explained by the fact that the few village industries that exist are in most cases small affairs which are unable to generate enough income to enable them engage paid labour even if the need arose.

The growth of village industries in terms of number of establishments and scale of operations is hindered by unfavourable economic conditions in the rural areas. For example, among the problems highlighted in section 6.2 was that of shortage of raw materials. This affected not only ventures
like knitting, sewing, baking of bread and scones and soap making, it also affected hammer mills.

This problem was in turn compounded by non-availability of transport which made it difficult and expensive to procure raw materials. Other constraints on the operations of village industries included that of limited market. This was in turn due to limited incomes and in some cases limited population concentrations. The most affected industries were carpentry, knitting and sewing.

These various factors, remoteness, poor communications, small population concentrations, low household incomes and the predominance of subsistence livelihood have hindered the growth and establishment of new village industries in the study areas. These problems have been aggravated by the worsening economic situation in the country which has increased the cost of raw materials and transport, while at the same time limiting the purchasing power of the rural population. In large part, these constraints explain the failure of some village industries and retail outlets in rural areas (see section 5.6, chapter 5). The closure of many retail outlets in the rural areas of Zambia was also noted by the ILO/JASPA basic needs mission to Zambia, (1981:71-73).

Since village industries are unable to overcome the constraints outlined above, they are unable to generate enough income to expand and thus enable them offer wage employment to
their local communities. It is in this context that the limited impact of village industries in providing wage employment must be understood. The village industries in Kanyanta are no exception. The carpentry workshop and hammer mill there were able to offer wage employment, but this was due to heavy subsidies from the VDF. It is doubtful whether the carpentry workshop and hammer mill will be able to sustain the wages once the VDF pulls out.

Conclusion

In conclusion it can be pointed out that, unless policies are designed to eliminate the various outlined constraints on the operations of village industries, the government's goal of providing wage employment to the rural population through such industries will not be realised.

6.4 Reducing rural-urban migration

In this section, findings as to the extent to which village industries in the sample clusters have contributed to reducing rural-urban migration are presented.

For a proper assessment of the relationship it was necessary and was initially planned to compare out-migration rates from villages with few village industries with those from villages with many village industries. The assumption was that, if out-migration rates were lower in those villages with many village industries then it may be concluded that village industries had contributed to reducing rural-urban migration. In making this assumption, allowance was made for the fact that
other factors besides village industries may have an influence on the out-migration rates. In addition it was planned that both employees and non-employees of village industries would be asked if they had any plans to migrate. The reasoning was that if more village industry employees had no plans to migrate compared to their counterparts then this would be additional evidence that village industries had helped and indeed can contribute to reducing rural-urban migration.

However, as indicated earlier in the text, such model villages and village industries did not exist. As a result, only a minor fraction of the data necessary and initially expected was collected.

Survey results, discussion and analysis

Analysing the motives for migration may not necessarily be the best way of discovering the extent to which village industries have helped or will help to reduce migration, but it provides information that has much bearing on this question. An understanding of the factors that led to migration can, among other things, provide a descriptive criterion against which the contribution of village industries to reducing rural-urban migration can be measured.

Many factors account for rural-urban migration but of the magnets that attract migrants the chief has been wage employment (Simmons, et al., 1984:22; Gugler, 1969:137; Clunies Ross, 1984:143; Todaro, 1971:391). In the study areas the wage
employment factor has also been dominant. The table Appendix 5.2, for example, shows the aggregated results of the reasons for migration. These have been recorded for the whole sample and each sub-sample respectively. It will be seen that the cash motive has been the dominant factor responsible for out-migration in the sample as a whole. Going by sample cluster it will again be observed that Mumba and Nseluka are the only sample clusters in which the cash motive account for less than half the migration. There education and marriage have been more important.

While rural-urban migration for reasons of education or marriage cannot be halted by establishing village industries, there is no doubt that migration for employment or cash income can be reduced if local village industries can provide employment and meet the cash needs of the potential migrants. Studies made elsewhere have shown that distance tends to discourage labour migration, as a result people will tend to find a job at close hand if possible (Mackel, 1971).

The findings of this study however indicate that village industries in the sample clusters have contributed little to the employment needs of the rural population (sections 6.2 and 6.3).

Furthermore, most of the co-operatives notably, the soap making and the homecraft clubs had elderly women as members (employees), but migrants are not elderly women. As demonstrated
in the last chapter the majority of migrants are the younger men and women aged 19 years and less. And while the VDF funded carpentry workshop and hammer mill have provided employment to young men, the total number employed in the two village industries was not more than 12 which is not enough to satisfy the employment needs of the community. It is therefore not surprising that Kanyanta which had village industries with "many" young employees should record the highest out-migration rates (21%) after Nseluka with (23%) (see Table 5.1). Furthermore, it is equally not surprising that Kanyanta should record the highest number of people that migrated for employment reasons after Chitimukulu (see Appendix 5.2).

The fact that Mumba which had only two village industries should record the lowest out-migration rates (see Table 5.1) suggests that other factors besides the number of village industries in the sample clusters have been more important in explaining the out-migration rates. The lower migration rates in Mumba are, among other things, due to the availability of a ready source of cash income from fishing. As a result of cash opportunities, there was clearly no need for young men to migrate. Not surprisingly, Mumba recorded only 15 (8 percent of total sample population) migrants to towns. Of this minority, the majority had migrated for reasons of education (33 percent) or marriage (33 percent), (see Appendix 5.2).
The postulated hypothesis was that: an inverse relationship exists between the rate of rural-urban migration and the number of village industries in the sending area. It was initially expected that villages with more village industries would have fewer people leaving the village because opportunities for employment will be available locally.

From the foregoing it is evident that there is no evidence to support the hypothesis. The village industry sector in the sample clusters is still small and weak to have any significant impact on the employment needs of the local communities. In particular since most village industries are not able to provide paid employment they have been unable to reduce migration for employment and related reasons.

6.5 Attracting migrants back to the villages

This section looks at the extent to which village industries in the sample clusters have helped to attract migrants back to villages. The postulated hypothesis was that villages with more village industries have consistently and significantly more return migrants than villages with less village industries. The reasoning behind the hypothesized relationship was outlined in chapter 4.

Survey results

Table 6.6 shows the reasons for returning to the village as indicated by the returnees. According to the table the returnees did so in response to a variety of stimuli, none which
appears to be related to established village industries. For example, the largest group of respondents (42 percent) returned because they got tired of town life. Evidence from informal discussions suggest that most returnees in the latter group returned because of economic hardships. Amongst women, this included divorcees and widows whose husbands had died while in urban areas. The next group comprised those who had gotten pension (19 percent). This was followed by those that had returned on account of poor health (11 percent). Other groups include those that returned because: they claimed to have saved enough cash or capital (10 percent), of old age (10 percent), they did not find a job (4 percent), of old age and pension (2 percent). The remaining two percent did not give responses.

Table 6.6 Principal reason for returning to the village as indicated by return migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for return</th>
<th>Number of migrants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Got tired of town life</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got pension</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health reasons</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saved enough cash (capital)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not find job</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age and pension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a breakdown of this information by village refer to Appendix 6.5.

Source: Field survey
The reasons for return indicated in the last paragraph can be grouped into two. There are those reasons that suggest that a plan had been fulfilled. This includes those that claimed to have saved enough cash or capital and those who had gotten pension. Then there is the other group whose responses suggest either that a plan, if there was one had been interrupted or at least that the migrant would have continued to live in town, if circumstances had not induced him or her to return. This group includes the divorcees, widows, those who could not find jobs, and those that returned because of poor health. In both cases, however, there was no indication that return was reinforced by established village industries in the villages. In most cases those that had saved enough capital or got pension, did indicate having a plan to put up some kind of village industry or some other commercial enterprise, but none indicated having been attracted by already established village industries.

The choice of the village to which the migrants returned is further evidence which shows that established village industries had little influence on the returnees. Table 6.7, for example, shows the responses given when the returnees were asked to indicate why they chose to return to their present village. According to the table, the most important consideration was the availability of relatives in the ancestral village. For example, out of the whole sample of returnees 90 percent mentioned the availability of relatives in the ancestral home. Only 8 percent
mentioned the availability of land for farming. Going by sample cluster it will be seen that in Mumba and Kanyanta, all the returnees indicated that the choice of village was influenced by the availability of relatives in the native village. In the other sample clusters, the returnees did mention the availability of land (7%) in Chitimukulu and 17 percent in Nseluka. The higher percentage who mentioned the availability of land in Nseluka is explained by the fact that this area initially started as a resettlement scheme, hence it attracted a number of prospective farmers including non natives.

Table 6.7 Return Migrant's response to the Question: "Why did you decide to return to this particular village" Summary of findings by village (Percent of total number of return migrants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total number of return migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatives/native home is here; House is here; Village age had great plenty potential of land/ for came to village farm industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>93  0  0  7  0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>100  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>77  0  0  17  6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>100  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>90  0  0  8  2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
Table 6.8 compares the number (Percentage) of return migrants to the number of village industries in each sample cluster. Although there were no significant differences in the number of village industries between sample clusters as initially expected, it can still be seen from the table that there is no consistent evidence to suggest that villages with more village industries have more return migrants.

The apparent larger number of returnees in Chitimukulu which had comparatively more village industries is worthy of comment. The larger number of returnees in Chitimukulu is not because they were attracted by established village industries. On the contrary this is because Chitimukulu had in the first place the highest number of migrants to urban areas (see Appendix 6.5). Since all sampled migrant household heads had returned at the time of the survey, it is natural that Chitimukulu should record a higher number of return migrants. Furthermore, since return migrants participate more in village industries than non-migrants (see section 5.5 in chapter 5), it logically follows that villages with more return migrants may have more village industries.
Table 6.8 Rates of return migration compared to the distribution of village industries by sample cluster (village)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Number of village industries</th>
<th>Number of return migrants (Percent of total sample of household heads) (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Raw data used for calculating these rates are given in Appendix 6.5.

Source: Field data

The fact that Chitimukulu had many village industries, mostly of the same kind (maize mills) which were grossly underutilised suggests that migrants come with a view of establishing their own village industries rather than investing in already established ones as postulated. In this regard a large number of village industries may not necessarily be an attraction to migrants as postulated.

To summarise, the findings show that return migrants in the sample clusters did so in response to a variety of stimuli none of which were related to established village industries. The findings also show that the choice of the village to which the migrants returned was determined in large part by the availability of relatives in the native home area. Furthermore, there is no evidence to suggest that a large number of village industries attracted or will attract return migrants.
From the foregoing it is apparent that the findings do not support the postulated hypothesis that villages with more village industries will attract more return migrants. Other factors besides village industries such as relatives in the home area, availability of land for farming and number of people that had left the village to urban areas have been more important in explaining the number of returnees. In this regard the number of village industries has in some cases been a response to the number of return migrants in the village and not vice versa as initially postulated. On the basis of these findings it seems reasonable to reject the hypothesis.

Discussion and conclusion

For most Zambians or at least those in the sample clusters, returning "home" is the final stage of the migration cycle. This is evident from the fact that in the sample clusters all household heads were home permanently or at least regarded their return as permanent at the time or at survey. This not only shows that social and cultural ties are still strong, it also suggests that few migrants envisage living their lives out in towns. Similar findings have been reported in other parts of Africa. For example, Caldwell (1969:185) pointed out that to most West Africans the ancestral village always remains "home".

Whether a return is accomplished at all is obviously dependent to a considerable extent on what goal has been set.
Household heads were asked to indicate why they had migrated. The responses are summarised in Table 6.9 below.

Table 6.9 Reasons for migrating as indicated by the heads of households (Percent of total number of former migrants).(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Reason for migrating to town</th>
<th>Total number of people who had migrated to urban areas n=49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Visit/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) for detailed information on the number of people who had and those had not migrated, refer to Appendix 6.5.

Source: Field data

The most outstanding feature to note about Table 6.9 is the dominance of the cash motive which was indicated by 74 percent of the respondents. The other reasons such as education, marriage and visiting relatives account for not more than 26 percent of the responses. While the cash motive was mentioned by the majority, only 29 percent appeared to have fulfilled the objective while in towns. This includes those who claimed to have saved enough cash or capital and those who had got pension (see Table 6.6). For those that could not raise enough cash or capital the majority returned indicating that they got tired of town life or perhaps because they could not find a job. Others postponed their return for so long that they were overtaken by old age and sometimes poor health or even death as in
the case of widows. For both groups of migrants money seems to be the main factor for returning to the village. For example, in one group sufficiency of money prompts return while in the other group it is the insufficiency of money that marks the end of the stay in town. As Caldwell (1969:190) has pointed out, a migrant faced with dwindling savings invariably feels he can eke them out further during his declining years in his native village, where housing is free, cheap, or already provided for, and where the society makes few demands for a heavy spending way of life.

Against this background of the context in which return migration in the sample clusters took place, it is easy to explain why there was no relationship between return migration and village industries in the manner postulated. For those returnees that had managed to accumulate some capital, established village industries had no bearing on their return because as indicated earlier, migrants came with a view to establish their own village industries rather than investing in already established ones. Similarly for the other group of migrants without savings, established village industries did not offer any opportunities for work even if some returnees might have had such intentions.

6.6 Improving living conditions

This section presents findings on the extent to which village industries in the sample clusters have helped to improve the living conditions of the local community. Apart from analysing the impact of village industries on the community at large, particular interest is
also on presenting findings to test the hypothesis that higher household incomes are associated with households whose members are employed in village industries.

Defining what constitutes an improvement in living conditions presents difficulties because in the first place the concept of living condition is vague and therefore open to different interpretations. In this study the concept of living condition is synonymous with living standard. Perhaps the most widely known definition of living standard is that of the United Nations which uses an index which combines many different aspects: health, diet, education, employment, working conditions, transport, consumption and savings, housing, clothing, recreation, social security and human freedom (Hammond 1979:126). While useful for highlighting the dimension of living standard such a definition is too open ended and inclusive to be useful for measurement purposes. Moreover, as Hammond (1979:126) had pointed out the concept of living standard ignores differing human perceptions, values and ideals. People with a high living standard can be less contented than others with a lower living standard.

In the same way, in attempting to measure an improvement in living condition(s) what an outsider may regard as an insignificant improvement may be regarded as significant by the local community and vice versa. In addition to the latter problem there is also the problem of deciding what should go into an index. Since there is no universal method of measuring an improvement in living condition, the
most appropriate technique would be a function of the research objective, the field situation and the researcher.

In this study it was decided to adopt a measure which took into account not only the goals envisaged by the government but also the respondents perceptions. A perception approach is concerned with the identification and measurement of people's evaluations of their situation (White and Burton, (1983:103). The value of including peoples' evaluation of their situations is that it can enable planners or decision makers to identify priorities for development projects, in this particular case it highlights the kind of village industries which would be most appropriate for the local people.

In order to obtain the respondent's views vis-a-vis the contribution of village industries to improved living conditions, the respondents were asked two related questions: (see question 48 in the interview schedule for village households, in Appendix 4.4). Firstly, they were asked to indicate whether or not they thought a large number of village industries can improve their living conditions. Secondly, those who gave a "yes" response to the first question were asked to indicate the way in which a large number of village industries can improve their living conditions.

The responses to the questions indicated above are summarised in tables 6.7 and 6.8 respectively (see Appendix 6.6). It will be seen from Table 6.7 that, when the sample is taken as a whole, an overwhelming majority (90%) gave the "yes" response to the first question indicating that they thought village industries can improve
their lives. Only 3 percent gave the "no" response to suggest that they thought village industries cannot improve their lives. The majority of respondents in the latter group indicated that the government cannot introduce a large number of village industries in the first place. Finally, 7 percent said they were not sure of what answer to give or simply that they had never thought about such a question.

Table 6.8 (Appendix 6.6) shows the aggregated and disaggregated (by sample cluster) results of responses on how village industries can improve the living conditions of the local people. Taking the sample as a whole it will be seen that the provision of goods and services features prominently. The latter was indicated by the majority of the respondents (54 percent). Informal conversations revealed that the goods and services referred to foodstuffs such as mealie meal, cooking oil, sugar, salt and other commodities such as soap. According to the respondents the provision of these commodities was important because it would save them from travelling long distances to markets. The second aspect that was mentioned was that of providing local sources of employment and cash incomes. This second category accounts for 17 percent of the responses. Included in this group are those respondents who indicated that village industries will encourage the utilisation of local raw materials. It was decided to merge the latter response with the former (employment) since the utilisation of local raw materials indirectly suggests that some people would find jobs in raw material extraction. Other categories include those who indicated both the provision of goods as well as employment (10 percent) and 10
percent which includes the "not applicable" and the "not sure" responses. The former refers to those who gave "no" to the first question as indicated in Table 6.7.

Hence according to the respondents the contribution of village industries to improved living conditions can be evaluated with reference to: the provision of goods and the amount of employment generated. To these two measures was added a third one, namely the material well being of village industry employees as compared to non-employees of village industries. Apart from helping to test the hypothesis indicated earlier, the latter measure helps to shed light on the extent to which village industries can contribute to improved living conditions as envisaged by the government. If employees of village industries are better off in terms of cash incomes than their counterparts then it may be concluded that establishing more village industries will improve the living conditions of the rural population.

Hence in the subsequent paragraphs the index to be used in evaluating the contribution of village industries to improved living conditions will be with reference to three criteria namely: the provision of goods and services; employment generated; and the material well being of village industry employees (as reflected in cash earnings) as compared to non-employees of village industries.

Admittedly, there are weaknesses in this particular index, the main one being that the measurement of aspects such as the provision of goods and services is descriptive and subjective. Despite this limitation the index however provides a useful working model for
evaluating the impact of village industries in improving living conditions since it takes into account not only the goals envisaged by the government but also the views of the people themselves. It is the hope of the researcher that future researches will be able to refine the index so that a standardised measure can be developed to permit valid comparisons.

Survey results

In terms of providing goods and services to the local people it seems fair to generalise that, according to the local people village industries have contributed to improving their living conditions by providing some hitherto unavailable goods and services. According to the respondents the availability of some goods and services locally had greatly helped them by reducing the distances they would have travelled to buy the same goods and services.

The impact of village industries in terms of generating local employment has been noted in the previous sections. There it has been noted that village industries in the sample clusters have contributed little to the employment needs of the local residents.

To summarise, the findings show that the people in the sample clusters consider the village industries to have improved their living conditions by providing some of the goods and services which would otherwise not have been available thus saving them long distances to markets. The village industries have however contributed little to the employment needs of the local population.
Having described the social and economic advantages of village industries to the local community at large, the study will now proceed to describe and analyse the impact of village industries on their employees.

The hypothesis to be tested at this stage is that: higher household incomes are associated with households whose members are employed in village industries. The reasoning behind the hypothesised relationship has already been outlined in chapter 4.

From the findings presented in sections 6.2 and 6.3 it is apparent that with the exception of the employees that were members of the village industries funded by the VDF, the other employees in the soap making co-operatives and privately owned maize mills were not any better off than other non-village industry employees. This is because the latter employees did not get any cash income as initially expected.

The village industries in Kanyanta, however, are a different case because there the employees of the carpentry workshop and maize mill received a monthly salary. With an average salary of K200-00 per month, the latter employees are able to get an annual income of K2,400 which is higher than the average in Kanyanta K1,639-00 or indeed the whole sample (K2088-00 per annum).\(^6\) Furthermore, although the study made no attempt to get respective household incomes from members of the

\(^6\) The average household income for Kanyanta and the whole sample was obtained by dividing the total recorded income per sample cluster (Table 5.7) by the number of respondents per sample cluster (whole sample)
homecraft village industry in Kanyanta it is likely that most of them also had incomes higher than the average for Kanyanta and the whole sample. This is because most members of the homecraft club (village industry) were also members of the literacy club, most of whom had recorded improved yields from their family plots (see Appendix 6.2 on the notes concerning the VDF).

The employees in Kanyanta, however, do not constitute the majority of employees who were in the village industries, so that the foregoing observation does not alter the conclusion that the majority of village industry employees are not better off in terms of incomes than the non-village industry employees. Furthermore, when the salaries of the latter employees are compared to those who worked for the government notably the teachers, health workers and agricultural assistants, it will be seen that the K2400-00 given to the employees in Kanyanta is far below the minimum wage given to those that worked for the government. According to the government white paper (1987) the minimum wage for a primary school teacher was K6,336-00 and that for a health assistant was K10,553-00 per annum.

From the foregoing, it is clear that the evidence does not support the hypothesis that employees of village industries are better off in terms of incomes than non-village industry employees. Employees in the government sector, and some progressive farmers and fishermen were certainly better off in terms of incomes than those who worked in the village industries.
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Discussion

Although the respondents indicated that village industries had contributed to improving their living conditions for reasons already stated, much more remains to be done in terms of alleviating rural poverty which is the ultimate goal of the government. As the ILO/JASPA Basic needs mission to Zambia (1981:57) noted: 'The target of an adequate livelihood has several dimensions. Most importantly it requires adequate stocks and flows of food and income for secure consumption for all household members in all seasons'.

From the description and discussion of village industries in this chapter it is apparent that their contribution to alleviating rural poverty is insignificant. For example, while the promotion of agro-based industries features prominently on the envisaged industries by the government (Village Industry Service Pamphlet) very little agricultural let alone food processing takes place in the sample clusters. Apart from the hammer mills there was no other kind of food processing in the sample clusters. Even where hammer mills were abundant as in Chitimukulu the problem (shortage) of mealie meal remains far from being solved. Not surprisingly, the first question that this researcher and his assistant was asked upon arrival in Chitimukulu was 'How are you going to eat? Have you got mealie meal? There is no mealie meal in this village!' In addition to the limited amount of food processing, the range of products locally produced remains small. The table in section 6.1 not only shows the limited number of village industries, it also highlights the limited range of
village industries. According to the table in section 6.1 the only products that were produced were carpentry products, soap and mealie meal. Since the range of products available locally is small and inadequate the people in the sample clusters are left with no option but to travel long distances to buy some basic needs such as mealie meal, relish, cooking oil, salt, sugar, soap and many other products.

Furthermore, by contributing little to the wage employment needs of the rural population the village industries in the sample clusters are not helping to alleviate rural poverty since without a source of a cash income a household(s) cannot improve its living conditions. As the ILO/JASPA Employment Advisory Mission (1977:70) noted: 'Productive employment implies the provision of minimum income to the "poor" and the "very poor" sections of the population who fall below the minimum standard of basic needs'. According to the same advisory mission productive employment also means providing employment opportunities for those who are openly unemployed, as well as opportunities for earning higher incomes, in cash or kind, for those already in employment but who are earning little (ILO/JASPA Employment Advisory Mission, 1977:71). From the description of village industries in the sample clusters it is clear that such goals remain far from being attained.

Conclusion

From the foregoing discussion, it is apparent that the mere introduction of village industries is not sufficient to improve the living conditions of the people unless the village industries are able to create sources of cash incomes and cater for some basic needs
particularly foodstuffs on which the rural population continue to spend highly especially in terms of transport to markets, thus worsening their suffering and poverty. As far as this study is concerned the village industries have contributed little to both the income needs as well as the provision of unavailable goods and services. The paper concludes that village industries have contributed little to improving the living conditions of the rural population.

6.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This chapter sought to investigate the extent to which village industries in the sample clusters have helped to achieve the government's goal(s) of: (a) providing wage employment to the rural population; (b) reducing rural-urban migration as well as (c) encouraging the return of migrants to villages and (d) improving the living conditions of the rural population.

Summary of major empirical findings

The salient feature about the sample clusters is the limited number of village industries, contrary to the picture portrayed by literature on this subject.

The village industries owned by individuals are really small affairs with an average labour force of one employee. Hence the latter enterprises have not made any significant contribution to the government's goal of providing employment to the rural population. Although the co-operatively run village industries have more employees than the former enterprises the number of employees is still far less than the number of persons, particularly the youth, needing
employment. In particular the village industries aided by the VIS caters for elderly women in terms of employment and provides no cash incomes thus contributing little to both the youth employment situation and the cash income needs of the rural communities. Since the village industries have contributed little to the employment needs of the people, they have not helped to reduce rural-urban migration particularly for reasons of employment which accounts for the majority of the migration.

Return migration remains an important aspect, at least in the sample clusters. This is indicated by the fact that all interviewed heads of households who had once migrated to urban areas had returned to the village. The findings, however, show that the return to the village was not influenced by established village industries. Other factors besides village industries have been more important in explaining not only the return to the village but also the village to which the migrants returned.

The evidence emerging from the survey suggests that village industries have contributed little to improving the living conditions of the people in the villages. This is because the village industries are small and limited not only in number but also in the scope of goods and services rendered.

In conclusion it must be pointed out that although politicians policy makers and researchers alike see in village industries the solution for the problem of rural-urban migration, rural unemployment
and rural poverty, there are several obstacles to actually attaining these goals. By far the largest obstacle is the unfavourable economic conditions prevailing in rural areas. These include remoteness, poor communications and limited markets. These factors have not only hindered growth of village industries, they have also been responsible for the closure of many retail outlets observed in many rural areas. Unless a "whole" package of policies to eliminate the various economic constraints outlined is implemented, village industries will remain small operations like those in the sample clusters, offering few opportunities for gainful employment which is ultimately the solution to the problems of rural poverty and rural-urban migration.
CHAPTER 7

OVERALL SUMMARY DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study had two broad objectives, firstly it sought to investigate the impact of rural-urban migration on the development of village industries, and secondly, it sought to investigate the impact of village industries on rural-urban migration, particularly the extent to which village industries have helped to reduce migration to urban areas. This final chapter draws together a summary of major findings followed by a discussion of the implication of these results for approaches to understanding migration and secondly for policy relating to both migration and village industries.

7.1 Summary of major empirical findings

The impact of rural-urban migration is summarised in chapter 5. The findings of this study show no evidence that migration has been detrimental to the development of village industries, instead, the findings show that migration had been an instrumental force in the development of village industries. For example, there is no evidence that migration has depleted the rural labour force, thus creating a labour shortage for existing or potential village industries because there is already an alarming rate of unemployment and underemployment in the countryside. Furthermore, the absence of migrants as part of household labour has not significantly affected or reduced household incomes, whose decline may imply a reduced market for the products of village industries. In addition, those who migrate especially the
younger and better educated are not necessarily the most able or most likely to innovate and mobilise resources for village industries. Hence rather than impoverishing the village, migration has saved the villages by releasing surplus unproductive labour from villages thus reducing pressure on limited household incomes, food supplies and employment opportunities. Another significant benefit has been the back flow of migrants with new ideas, skills and capital which has been instrumental in the establishment of village industries. Recent studies in other parts of Zambia (Chilivumbo, 1980; Chanda, 1985) have also highlighted the positive contribution of those who migrate and later return, to various aspects of the rural economy.

The second issue of major empirical significance relates to the contribution of village industries to reducing the numbers of people migrating to urban areas (chapter 6). Although no conclusive evidence can be presented, the evidence emerging from the survey suggests that, village industries have contributed little to the observed decline in the rates of rural-urban migration. This is because the village industries are not only few, but also because the few that exist are small operations which are unable to offer employment opportunities let alone significant incomes for their employees. As a result village industries have been unable to reduce migration particularly for reasons of employment which comprises the bulk of the migration stream. Furthermore due to problems relating to transport, shortage of raw materials, small population concentrations along with the low purchasing power of the bulk of the rural population it is doubtful
whether existing village industries will prosper. The same problems seem to be the major constraints hindering the establishment of new village individuals by individuals as well as organisations such as the VIS and the VDF.

7.2. Discussion of Findings

In chapter one, reference was made to the negative view with which policy makers and researchers alike have tended to regard the process of rural-urban migration in relation to the rural economy. The view held by the government policy makers and politicians is synonymous with what Clunies Ross (1984:11) terms as "rural-desert" theory. According to this theory the rural exodus denudes the countryside of the most productive younger members, leaving largely the old and young children who cannot spearhead agricultural development and other community based development projects.

From findings presented in chapter five, and the summary in this chapter, it is clear that, the generalisations outlined above are not true. All this is not to say migration is always beneficial, but rather to point out that, the negative perception towards migration in relation to the rural economy as adopted by policy makers presents an oversimplified picture. As Chanda (1985:17) points out, the negative perception has been perpetuated more by the apparent urban problems and less by an understanding of the actual relationship between migration and rural development. As mentioned earlier in chapter 5, the charges made against migration may have been true in the period before and immediately after independence, when the rates of migration or
absenteeism were high (see chapters 3 and 5) and when migration involved both the young and old. But the same cannot be said of migration today.

Furthermore, rather than viewing rural-urban migration as an irrational process by which rural inhabitants are 'attracted like moths to a candle flame, regardless of employment opportunities, wages, living conditions, and whatever is happening in their places of origin' (Clunies Ross, 1984:4), policy makers should perhaps view the phenomenon as a rational response by which families and individuals are seeking 'a improvement in their conditions. For example, the comparatively lower rates of out-migration in one of the study areas, Mumba, which is a fishing village with many opportunities for earning high cash incomes suggests that; in large part, migration to urban areas is a response to employment opportunities. As the ILO/JASPER mission to Zambia (1981:58) has noted, where rural earning opportunities are slight and seasonal men tend to migrate. In contrast, where there are productive activities available at all seasons, promising a continuous flow of food and income around the year, out-migration has been low. The ILO/JASPER mission (1981:58) cites the Chambeshi area with its combination of rice growing and fishing as one such area with low out-migration rate. It is interesting to note that one of the study areas referred to above, Mumba, is found in this area and its economy is based on rice and fishing (see chapter 3).
If this brief account of the major cause of rural-urban migration is broadly correct, it follows that establishment of village industries can diminish migration or absenteeism if they can provide a promising and continuous flow of income to enable the rural population to meet their basic needs in food and clothing. But if the village industries are few as observed in the study areas (see chapter 6), and if the few that exist do not offer a promising and continuous flow of income, then the majority will not be any better off than before and they will continue to migrate.

Policy makers underestimate the unfavourable economic conditions in rural areas (transport problems, lack of raw materials and limited markets) and attribute the limited number of village industries in rural areas to lack of finance on the part of potential entrepreneurs. Not surprising much emphasis is placed on mobilising resources to provide credit to potential village industry entrepreneurs (see Zambia Daily Mail, 21 March and 10, 19, and August 1988). Yet as demonstrated in chapter 6, even where village industries are heavily subsidized such as those by the VDF, the onward march towards the goal of sustained growth is inhibited by the unfavourable conditions which are far more powerful than the mere provision of resources.

In sum, there has been a failure on the part of policy makers and politicians to learn whether from largescale industry in the urban centres or the thriving small industries in urban centres that, for a business concern to prosper it must have a continuous flow of raw materials and a vast accessible market for the sale of its products.
Furthermore, the more advanced the economy the more the chances of village industries to thrive, that is why there are many upcoming small industries popularly known as "SIDO" in the urban centres of Zambia.

7.3 Lessons for policy

1. Migration from rural to urban areas is a rational process as well as an instrumental force in the development of village industries, and rural areas in general.

Firstly, it is rational in the sense that it is a response by which individuals seek an improvement in their social and economic conditions.

For example, the fact that most interviewed household heads who had previously migrated for employment reasons had returned (see chapter 5) implies that most of the people leave the village for clear investment reasons (related to a future in the village). Others migrated to continue their education, while most women left the village to join their husbands (see Appendix 5.2). In all these cases migration is rational since it enabled the migrants to satisfy their social and economic needs which could possibly not be met in the village.

Secondly, migration is instrumental in the development of village industries in the sense that some migrants acquire not only capital but also skills, ideas and attitudes which as indicated in chapter 6 have been instrumental in the development of village industries. As Chilivumbo (1980) and Chanda (1985) point out, migration to cities provide a "cosmopolite" experience, and since return migrants are often pace-setters in various rural development projects, these migrations to
urban areas could serve as a source of new ideas and a stimulus for innovation in the rural areas.

If migration to urban areas is rational and instrumental, and if this same migration eases the pressure on limited employment and food supplies in rural areas (see chapter 5 and section 7.2), perhaps policy makers must abandon the view that it is bad in itself, at least in relation to the rural economy. But cursing migration in the way that it should be forbidden (see chapter 1), would indicate an inadequate understanding on the part of policy makers and politicians of the causes as well as the beneficial aspects of rural-urban migration to the rural economy.

If policy makers do not like the consequences of rural urban migration in urban areas (see page 1) they ought to be looking to the circumstances that induce it: to the inequalities between rural and urban areas in opportunities for employment, income and social services and, to the rural poverty which provokes it. As Clunies Ross (1984: 13 points out "we should not confuse the symptom with the disease". If urban growth is in danger of becoming excessive, dispersion of government activities, and investment in rural transport, industry, social infrastructure is one way of mitigating this tendency. If the jobs are there in rural areas and smaller towns, people will go there. While not reducing the rate of migration this change in direction would reduce the problem of the largest cities (Byerlee, et. al., 1977:107).

2. The finding that the probability of migrating is higher among those who have received some education (section 5.2) implies that
although rates of rural-urban migration are declining (chapter 5) migration to urban areas may not cease altogether as the various rural primary and secondary schools continue to produce school leavers. This is because the school curricula continue to be urban oriented with emphasis on progression to colleges or universities and at the end of it all, a white collar job. Even where trade schools are located in rural areas, graduates come out with modern sector skills: electricians, metal fabricators and spray painters to name a few. At the moment universities are to be found in the urban centres, and at the same time the educated migrants have a better chance of finding job requiring educated manpower in the urban centre than if they stayed in the village. Hence migration of educated young men and women should be expected to continue in the foreseeable future.

If the government policy makers and politicians want the educated young men and women to remain in the rural areas then jobs requiring educated manpower must be created in rural areas. One such policy would be to decentralise government administration and large industry to the rural areas (see lesson for policy 1 above, and 3 below). For example, at the moment it is not uncommon to find that the bulk of the manpower in government departments such as the Ministry of Agriculture, Wild Life and Tourism and organisations such as the VIS as well as other non-governmental organisations (NORAD, EBC, WORLD VISION) are concentrated in the capital city and yet most of the activities of these various ministries and organisations are concentrated in rural areas.
Furthermore, studies made elsewhere have indicated that rural areas could be attractive to educated migrants if jobs and rural earnings are equivalent to urban jobs (Byerlee, et al, 1977; Hanson, 1980). This means jobs must not only be created in rural areas, but also that earnings should be attractive. These measures if accompanied by major investments in rural infrastructure such as transport, water supply, clinics, electricity, housing and cinemas, would go a long way in not only attracting migrants, but would also help them to hold them in these areas. Unless the various measures outlined above are carried out, no amount of force can make the young and educated members to remain in rural areas and villages some of which are deprived of even minor investments in transport and water supply (see chapter 3).

3. On the impact of village industries on reducing rural-urban migration, and related goals of providing employment raising rural incomes and living conditions, the findings of this study suggest that the onward march towards this realisation will backslide as long as development is seen only in terms of a single variable; village industries.

The establishment of village industries must be accompanied by the provision of an adequate economic infrastructure in the form of transport and other small industries to provide raw materials and buy products from village industries. These investments along with with a combination of favourable market circumstances (large population with a large labour force in agriculture and other rural industries) would not only provide the market for the products of village industries but
would also attract private capital and initiative. In other words capital must be invested not only in village industries but in the whole complex structure of the rural economy simultaneously. It is only within this broader environment of circumstance and influences, that village industries can operate economically and thus contribute to the government's goal of employment generation, provision of incomes of raise living conditions which would subsequently not only attract the unemployed in urban areas but also reduce the rural exodus in search of urban jobs.

Since the kind of transformation of the rural economy and environment as outlined above is expensive and beyond the means of most Third World countries including Zambia, resources should be concentrated in a few selected small and intermediate rural towns centres to act as "growth poles". These small towns could be able to offer market, service and storage facilities to the surrounding agricultural areas. This would in turn generate an enormous number of jobs in services, trade and distribution. Village industries will also be stimulated by the enlarged market (large labour force in other industries including those buying products from village industries).

The Zambian government has tried several rural development programmes modelled on the principle of the "growth pole" by concentrating resources in selected areas in a bid to stimulate accelerated self sustaining development likely to spread to surrounding areas. Examples of such programmes include the village regrouping programme (see section on Nseluka, chapter 3), intensive development
zones, (Evans, 1981), and resettlement schemes (SNDP, 1971:167-8; Mbulo, 1987:132-3). Those who have followed the development of these various programmes will admit that not a single programme did or has generated the expected growth. Although various reasons have been advanced for the failure of these projects, the most important factor in relation to the envisaged goal of accelerated self-sustaining development, is that these programmes have been enacted as isolated projects where development is seen in terms of a single variable, agriculture. This strategy of relying solely on agriculture to generate sustained growth is inadequate for two reasons. The first is that, at the moment, agricultural producing areas merely serve as raw material reservoirs for provincial centres where the farm produce is taken by co-operative unions. Even when farmers have been paid by co-operative unions, most villages (see chapter 3) have no markets or retail shops where they can buy their basic goods: mealie meal, soap, cooking oil and candles. Villagers thus have to travel to district centres to buy goods that they need. In this way most of the money is spent on travelling or in buying goods outside the village. As a result there is little circulation of the money within the village.

1. Out of the three programmes outlined, only the resettlement scheme programme has survived from the 1960's, with the renewed interest in the programme being manifested by the establishment of Youth Schemes in 1988 (Times of Zambia, April 2, 1988) and the setting aside of more than K20 million in 1989 for the same programme (Budget Address, January, 1989)
Secondly, agriculture per se can only have a short term and limited impact in providing employment to the rural population. This is particularly the case where increased productivity eventually leads to reduced demand for labour. Hence although an agricultural region may be prosperous only a few households will have land while the majority, the farm labourers will still be poor. Under these conditions market for retail trade, village industries and other commercial ventures will be limited. These conditions will in turn make an area less attractive for private capital and initiative. Under these conditions self sustained growth cannot take place in villages.

From a review of these various policies in relation to village industries as well as the government programmes based on agricultural development, it is clear that, to successfully serve as an alternative area of development a location has to be planned as a region more or less self contained. Investment must be in the whole complex structure of the rural economy and not merely village industries or agriculture.

4. There is need for policy makers to constantly monitor, evaluate, and determine the appropriateness of village industries being established by individuals as well as organisations, to the type of productive sector envisaged in the future. For example one stated or implied consequence of the government's emphasis on the promotion of village industries is that of securing the basic human needs of the rural population. Yet a review of the literature (chapter 2), and the findings of this study (chapter 6) indicate that there is a bias
towards such activities as carpentry, tailoring and knitting. As Milimo, (1987:29), as well as findings of this study indicate (chapter 6), activities such as carpentry require large population concentrations as well as a high purchasing power to enable them find markets for their products. The same could be said of enterprises such as tailoring and knitting. As Musampa, (1986:201) points out, activities such as tailoring need locations along the line of rail and urban centres which are more favoured than rural areas because the various inputs (such as buttons, zip fasteners and trimmings) can easily be brought together and the market is readily available there.

At low levels of income demand will be for basic commodities particularly food (Livingstone, 1969:25). For example at the moment most villages including some of the study areas have no hammer mills and people have to travel long distances to buy or grind maize into mealie meal. In addition villages have no oil expellers to extract oil from soya beans or groundnuts. Furthermore, vegetable and honey preservation and bottling would not only ensure a continued supply of essential vitamins at all seasons, but would also avoid the wastage of such products in the countryside. To sum up, at the moment priority must be given to village industries processing food products in demand in the villages. Only when incomes increase will it be more feasible to set up village industries processing such items as furniture, knitting products and clothes (see also ILO/JASPA basic needs mission to Zambia, 1981:91).
Another stated government objective which needs to be publicised as well as monitored relates to the use of local raw materials. Individual entrepreneurs as well as organisations such as the VIS must be encouraged to set up industries which use local raw materials. Maize mills are a case in point. These should be encouraged because the main raw material input, maize, is grown in most rural parts of Zambia as the staple crop. Such a strategy would prevent costly mistakes as has been the case with the VIS funded soap making project as well as the knitting, tailoring, and bread making co-operatives funded by either the VIS or the VDF in the study areas. In addition, there were ample examples of unoperational village industries because they were set up without regard to the supply of raw materials. Examples include the Mungwi Cooking Oil project and the Masela bakery. The latter projects have been set up in Mungwi Township (see map 2 in chapter 3) by the VDF. The lessons to be learned from such projects as well as the operations of the hammer mills in the study areas is that, investment in village industries must be accompanied where necessary and where possible by a matching investment in sources of raw materials. In this respect organisations must emulate the VDF which has adopted a kind of integrated approach (investing in village industries as well as agriculture to supply the raw materials, (see chapter 6 and Appendix 6.2 on VDF news and notes in brief).

Another observation worthy of separate comment relates to the composition of the co-operatives aided by the VDF and the VIS. During the field survey it was observed that most members of the co-operatives
were women. The emphasis on rural women may help to raise household incomes, but may not be giving employment to the younger men and women who may continue to be placing a heavy burden on limited household incomes thus defeating the objective of raising rural household incomes. At the same time integrating women in co-operatives may slow down migration among the older generation (which as indicated in chapter 5, has declined), but may not be giving employment to the young and they will continue to migrate to cities thus worsening the problems already being experienced there. There is thus a need for both the VIS and VDF to extend their service to the rural youth who form the bulk of the unemployed in the rural areas. Furthermore, concerted efforts must be made to identify and extend services to return-migrants. As indicated earlier in the chapter, some of the return-migrants acquire worthwhile skills which should be exploited for the benefit of the rural community at large.

Finally, some of the policies recommended vis-a-vis village industries are not only conflicting but grossly inadequate to have a long term positive impact on the rural economy particularly the problem of unemployment and rural-urban migration. For example, one stated objective of the VIS is the promotion of small village or cottage industries using simple machinery or equipment and requiring minimal capital to ensure that the cost of creating jobs is as low as possible (Council for Social Development, 1981:11). In other words there is a deliberate policy to ensure that such village industries remain small operations to reduce the capital requirements including the possibility
of having to rely on imported components. In addition, there is a deliberate policy to maintain small operations since the latter are less likely to disrupt social life in the village. Informal conversations with an official at the VIS in Kasama would seem to verify the fore-going observations. For example in referring to the planned involvement of VIS in the exploitation of salt deposits in Mpika and Kaputa, the latter official pointed out that VIS did not want to bring in modern technology as NORAD and SIDA had wanted. Secondly, in relation to the exploitation of chalk deposits (for lime production) in Isoka and Nakonde, the same official pointed out that VIS did not want to make the project a large scale commercial venture, but simply to have small industries involving local chiefs and local people supervised by an advisor for VIS.

While plans to approach the village industrialisation programme through small and simple industries is generally correct, it must also be remembered that small cottage industries can generate only limited incomes as well as employment opportunities. The envisaged goals are that such village industries should be able to reduce the problem of unemployment not only in villages but also in urban areas by attracting the unemployed from urban to rural areas. It is doubtful whether encouraging small cottage industries will be enough to solve the already alarming unemployment in the country side let alone the overall youth unemployment in the country which stood at 2 million as of March 1989 (Times of Zambia, March 13, 1989). This is not to say village or cottage industries must be discouraged in favour of large scale
industry but rather to point out that small industries are not an alternative approach to medium and large scale industry, but rather it is an approach that should complement it (Nyirongo, 1984). In this regard organisations such as SIDO and SEP which promote medium scale industries must be encouraged to extend their services to the rural areas once some initial government investments are made (see section 7.3, lesson for policy 3). Since the latter organisations promote relatively large establishments compared to VIS, they have a greater potential for creating the much needed employment opportunities in the countryside.

7.4 Conclusion

There is need for the government to increase investment in rural areas in order to reduce the rural-urban differentials in opportunities for employment, incomes and social services that to a large extent are responsible for rural-urban migration. In addition, agricultural performance must be be improved by providing resources for transport, credit, prompt and timely arrival of inputs and payment of farmers. Once this is done there is no doubt that incomes of many households will improve and this will lead to a further decline in numbers.

---

2. There is no clear-cut definition of what constitutes a small, or medium scale industry in Zambia. In most cases however the dividing line is based on the value of capital assets. The value of capital assets has tended to fluctuate due to the ever changing rates of inflation. In 1988, any enterprise with capital assets worth K25,000 was termed small-scale industry, and between K25,000 and K250,000 as medium scale industry.
migrating to search for employment. But halting rural-urban migration without the changes outlined above would not be a fair and efficient solution to the problems that the rural unhabitants face. As the study has demonstrated the rural areas benefit greatly as a result of rural-urban and urban-rural migration. With regard to the village industry strategy, it may well be argued that the strategy will not be feasible in the rural areas because of the very inequalities between rural and urban areas in opportunities for employment, incomes and the social and economic infrastructure which perpetuate rural poverty. As long as the rural incomes are low the needs of the rural population, though real, cannot be translated into effective demand (ILO/JASPA) basic needs mission to Zambia, 1981:91-92). Hence, the village industrialisation programme is only within a context of a feasible comprehensive strategy for rural development, dedicated to ensuring that rural incomes and living conditions approach those in urban areas. Only such a comprehensive strategy and the policies and programmes undertaken to implement it (see section 7.3) would provide conditions under which village industries can thrive and contribute to rural development and a subsequent reduction in rural-urban migration.
APPENDICES

NOTE: The Appendices are labelled in relation to respective sections in the text.
Distribution of household heads by age group. Summary of findings across and by village. (Percentages in brackets.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>(Young)</th>
<th>(Middle) 20-40 years</th>
<th>(old) 40 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>12 (40)</td>
<td>18 (60)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>19 (63)</td>
<td>11 (37)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>13 (32)</td>
<td>27 (68)</td>
<td>40 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyante</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>23 (77)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>51 (39)</td>
<td>79 (61)</td>
<td>130 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
Appendix 4.4

Interview schedules

. Interview schedule for household heads

. Interview schedule for village industry entrepreneurs
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR VILLAGE HOUSEHOLDS

SURVEY OF MIGRATION PATTERNS AND VILLAGE INDUSTRIES IN SELECT VILLAGES, NORTHERN PROVINCE, ZAMBIA IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE MASTER OF SCIENCE DEGREE (GEOGRAPHY), UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

BY

S. M. SALATI

SPONSORS: Cabinet office (DMDT), Lusaka

GENERAL INFORMATION

d. Isoka e. Mpika f. Luwingu
g. Kaputa h. Chinsali i. Chilubi

2. Name of village ________________________________

3. Location of village a. within 30km from district headquarters
   b. beyond 30km from district headquarters

4. Village economic base
   a. mainly fishing
   b. mainly agricultural
   c. mainly trading
   d. other (specify) _______________________

5. Sex of household head a. male  b. female

6. Age of household head a. less than 19 years
   b. 20 - 39 years
   c. 40 years and above
7. Educational background.
   a. none
   b. primary
   c. secondary
   d. above secondary/professional

8. Is household head
   a. unemployed
   b. self employed
   c. in wage employment
   d. other (specify) ____________

9. If household head is self employed indicate kind of employment
   a. farming (specify) ____________
   b. fishing (specify) ____________
   c. carpentry _________________
   d. other (specify) ____________

10. If in wage employment, who is the employer
    a. district council
    b. village industry
    c. private firm
    d. other (specify) ____________

11. Number of dependent children
    - male _________________
    - female ________________

12. Number of dependent adults
    - male _________________
    - female ________________
    TOTAL ________________
GENERAL MIGRATION DATA

(To household head)

13. Have you ever migrated or lived elsewhere?
   a. yes  
   b. no

14. If the answer to question 13, is yes indicate kind of migration.
   a. had migrated to urban area
   b. had migrated to rural area
   c. had lived elsewhere (urban)
      and then came to this village
   d. Had lived elsewhere (rural) and then came to this village.

15. How long were you away from this village?
   a. less than one year
   b. between one and 5 years
   c. 6 - 10 years
   d. over 10 years
   e. not applicable (specify) ______

16. Why did you decide to leave this village (to those who had previously lived in village)
   a. education
   b. health reasons
   c. to visit relatives in town/other villages.
   d. employment/raise capital to invest in village
17. What was the age at the time of migration?
   a. Less than 19 years
   b. 20 - 39 years
   c. 40 and above

18. What was the level of education at the time of out-migration?
   a. none    b. primary
   c. secondary d. above secondary
   e. no reply

19. How many adult members are away (urban area)
   Male ________ Female ________ Total __________

20. What were the reasons for migrating?
   a. Education
   b. Health reasons
   c. Relatives in town
   d. Employment reasons
   e. Marriage
   f. Other (specify) ________________

21. What was the age of the migrant(s) when he/she (they) left the village
   a. less than 19 years
   b. 20 - 39 years
   c. 40 and above years

22. What was the level of education of the migrant(s) when he/she (they left)

a. none
b. primary

[ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
  |------------------|

Migrant

Education

| | | | | | |
| | | | | |

c. secondary
d. above secondary

Out-migration and household income:

23. What changes has migration of household members brought to household? Indicate one or more reason as follows:

a. less labour to do housework
b. there is less household income
c. there is less food in household
d. there is more food in household
e. there is more money from remittances
f. no significant changes
g. other (elaborate) __________________________________________________________________________

24. With which migrants are these changes associated. (Indicate kind of change, as outlined above).

a. household head ____________________________________________
b. male adult members _________________________________________
c. female adult members _______________________________________
d. children ________________________________________________
25. Why are these changes associated with.
   a. household head
   b. male migrants
   c. female migrants
   d. children

   Return migration and villages industry)
   (To household head)

26. What was the reason for returning to the village?
   a. old age
   b. did not find job
   c. got pension
   d. had saved enough cash/capital
   e. got tired of town life
   f. other (elaborate)

27. Why did you decide to return to this particular village?
   a. relatives are here
   b. house is here
   c. there is a lot of potential for village industry
   d. the village has great potential for development
   e. there is plenty of land
   f. other (elaborate)

28. Were you involved in cash crop or cattle before or after migration?
   a. before
   b. after
c. both but with significant improvement (out-put)

d. both but with no significant change (out-put)

e. no reply

29. Were you involved in some business (non-agric) before or after migration.

a. before

b. after

c. both but with significant improvement (out-put)

d. both but no significant change (out-put)

e. no reply

30. Were you involved in local semi-skilled or skilled employment before or after migration.

a. before

b. after

c. both

d. no reply

31. Would you say you have gained new skills useful in the village?

a. yes  b. not at all  c. no reply

32. If answer to question 31 is yes, can you elaborate

a. increased education

b. more business minded

c. leadership qualities

d. technical skills

e. other (specify)
VILLAGE INDUSTRY AND WAGE EMPLOYMENT

33. Are there any household members in wage employment
   a. yes  b. no.

34. If yes, how many are employed ________________

35. Indicate kind of employment

   a. farming

   b. fishing

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   c. trading

   d. repairs

   e. teaching/other
government

   f. other (specify) ______

36. Who is the employer

   a. government  b. parastatal etc.

HOUSEHOLD INCOME

37. Apart from wage employment, does household have other sources of cash income

   a. yes  b. no.

38. If yes, from what source(s) (indicate amounts)

   a. fishing  K____________

   b. trading  K____________

   c. sale of own and family
labour  K____________
d. repairs

K

e. brewing

K

f. other (specify)____

K

39. Do you receive any remittances from relatives in an urban area?
a. yes     b. no

30. If yes, how often

a. every month

b. once every 3 months

c. 4 - 6 months a year

d. other (specify)______________________________

41. On average would you say the value of each remittance is

a. less than K100

b. K101 - 300

c. 301 - 500

d. 501 - 700

e. over K700

42. What are the remittances used for

a. household consumption

b. subsistence agriculture

c. commercial agriculture

d. hiring labour

e. invested in village industry

f. other,(specify) _______________________________
43. If remittances are not sent how does this affect the household.
   a. less food
   b. less money for hiring labour
   c. less money for school children
   d. no significant effect
   e. not sure/never thought about it.

44. Indicate goods, if any which the household makes for use within the house

45. Indicate goods/services, if any which the household purchases from local village industry.

46. If any services or goods are purchased from local industry, are you satisfied with the quality of goods/services offered?
   a. very satisfied
   b. satisfied
   c. dissatisfied
   d. very dissatisfied
   e. no reply

47. In your opinion are there any goods which you buy from shops, which you think can be made by local industry.

If yes indicate kind of goods
48. If more village industries are established do you think this will improve the living conditions of the people (yes/no) can you elaborate

49. If more village industries are established do you think this will reduce rural-urban migration? (yes/no) can you elaborate.

- END -

THANK YOU VERY MUCH
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR VILLAGE INDUSTRY PROPRIETORS

LOCATION OF ENTERPRISE


2. Name of Village: ____________________________

OWNER CHARACTERISTICS

3. Age  1. less than 19 years __________________
          2. 20 - 39 _____________________________
          3. 40 and above _______________________

4. Sex  1. male ______________________________
          2. female _____________________________

5. Education background

          1. none ______________________________
          2. primary ___________________________
          3. secondary __________________________
          4. higher institution/professional __________

6. Migration history

          1. migrant ____________________________
          2. non-migrant __________________________

7. If migrant. Type of previous migration

          1. rural-rural___________________________
          2. rural-urban_________________________
8. Length of period away from village
   1. less than 5 years _________________
   2. 6 - 10 years _________________
   3. 11 years and over _________________

9. Do you have any work apart from this?
   1. yes _________________
   2. no _________________

10. If yes, specify
    1. farming _________________
    2. fishing _________________
    3. formal employment _________________
    4. other (specify) _________________

THE ENTERPRISE

11. Kind of enterprise (ie tailoring, brickmaking, milling) specify _________________

12. When was the enterprise started? _________________

13. How did the enterprise begin? _________________
   1. started himself _________________
   2. inherited from relative _________________
   3. co-operative effort in village _________________
   4. institutional/government encouragement _________________
   5. other (specify) _________________
14. Type of ownership

1. owned by one person ______________________
2. owned by family ______________________
3. owned by company ______________________
4. partnership ______________________
5. other (specify) ______________________

15. Is the business run on

1. full time ______________________
2. part time ______________________
3. varies ______________________

16. Where did the money/capital to start business come from?

1. remittances ______________________
2. Self help/savings__________________
3. loan ______________________
4. other (specify) ______________________

17. Type of workshop

1. open air ______________________
2. mud house ______________________
3. brick house ______________________
4. other (specify) ______________________

18. Capital outlay (type of machinery used/available)

1. does not use machines ____________
2. uses machinery ________________
19. Estimated cost of machinery if available,

1. 

20. What is the size of labour force (no of workers)

21. Composition of labour force. (indicate number)

1. family _____ 2. hired labour ____
3. apprentices____ 4. local _______
5. non-local ______

22. Type of labour force (indicate number)

1. part time (piece worker) ______________
2. full time __________________________
3. skilled ____________________________
4. unskilled __________________________
5. female ___________________________
6. male _______________________

23. Do you have problems relating to the labour force.

1. yes ______________
2. no __________________

24. If yes, what kind of problems

1. theft ______________
2. labour shortage ______
3. lack of skills __________
4. not hard working __________
5. no money to pay them ______
6. other (specify) __________
25. From the answers given in 24 list the three most important problems in order of importance (rank)

1. 

2. 

3. 

26. If, labour shortage why?

1. too much out-migration
2. low wages
3. other, (specify) 

27. Where do you get your raw materials from?

1. local area (village)
2. district centre and surrounding area
3. urban areas
4. other (specify)

28. Do you have problems in getting raw materials?

1. yes
2. no

29. If yes, can you specify.

1. transport
2. lack of capital
3. erratic supply
4. other (specify) 

30. How much do you spend on raw materials per month ___________________________
   per year ___________________________
31. How many items do you produce per month. __________________________
32. How many of these on average do you sell per month ________
33. What is the average monthly sales in Kwacha? ___________
34. Are you satisfied with your scale of operation?
   1. yes        2. no
35. If no, specify-
   1. people have no money to buy goods
   2. there are few people to buy the goods
   3. people do not like the goods
   4. competition from superior quality goods
   5. other (specify) __________________________
36. From the answers given in question (35), can you list the two most important reasons, in order of importance.
   1. _______________________________________
   2. _______________________________________
37. What do you think, is the solution to your marketing problems
1. government protection against competition from urban goods
2. improve transport facilities
3. government must establish market stalls in the district centres
4. other (specify)

38. Can you rank the solutions given to question (37)

1.
2.
3.

39. Where do you sale your produce?

1. local area
2. local and surrounding areas (villages)
3. local, surrounding villages and district
4. local, surrounding villages, district and other provinces.

(Additional information)
40. Have you ever got any assistance from the government or some other organisation?

1. yes 2. no

41. If yes, can you name the organisation?

1. government
2. Village Industry Service
3. Small Scale Industry Organisation
4. bank (indicate kind of bank) __________________________
5. other (specify) __________________________

42. What kind of assistance did you get, from the above named (q.41) organisation.

1. loan
2. training
3. marketing
4. supply of raw materials
5. other (specify) __________________________

43. Are you satisfied with the kind of help you got/are getting.

1. yes 2. no

44. If no, what kind of additional help do you require?

1. money
2. raw material
3. marketing services
4. improve transport system
5. government to resettle people
6. Other (specify) __________________________
45. Can you rank your choices given in Q.(44)

1. 

2. 

3. 

46. Do you keep a record of your transactions?

1. yes 2. no

47. Do you have a bank account.

1. yes 2. no

48. If yes, specify,

1. bank 2. post office

3. building society 4. others (specify) ________

49. Are you able to save little income each month in the bank or you just manage to cover expenses.

1. save 2. don't save

50. If you are able to save little money, (profit) what is this money used for.

1. leave in bank

2. pay for children’s school

3. invest back in business

4. invest in agriculture

5. Other (specify) _________________________________
51. If more village industries like yours are developed
   (a) do you think this will reduce rural-urban migration?

   ________________________________

   (b) do you think this will improve living conditions of the
       people in village?

   ________________________________

52. Have you ever heard of an organisation called Village
    Industry Service?

   1. yes  2. no

53. If yes, do you know the purpose for which it was formed?

   1. yes  2. no

54. If yes, (specify) ________________________________

   ________________________________

- END -

THANK YOU VERY MUCH
Appendix 5.1

Rates of out-migration across and by village
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kannanurka</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestiaka</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittemkunj</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>&amp; of</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>&amp; of</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>&amp; of Adults</td>
<td>&amp; of Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Absent Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.2

Summaries of some characteristics of migrants and reasons for migration
as follows: migrant one, age: until the age of all

select. if the household had many migrants information was collected on each migrant

NOTES: 1. Each household interviewed was asked to give the age of the migrant(s) when he/she

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group (years)</th>
<th>(100) 135</th>
<th>(100) 34</th>
<th>(100) 49</th>
<th>(100) 59</th>
<th>(100) 15</th>
<th>(100) 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Chittimukku</th>
<th>Kanniyakumari</th>
<th>Nettukara</th>
<th>Mumba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total migrant(s)

Number (and % of migrants)

Age group of migrants across and by village

Age of migrants during out-migration: summary of findings
Each migrant was recorded.

If the household had many migrants the reason(s) for out-migration of each migrant(s). Each household interviewed was asked to indicate the reason for out-migration of the household head interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Out-migration</th>
<th>Marriage</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Retirement in Town</th>
<th>Health Reasons</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
<td>14 (44)</td>
<td>19 (55)</td>
<td>20 (59)</td>
<td>12 (39)</td>
<td>5 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number (and %) of Migrants</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
<td>7 (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chittrimkuju Village**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Households Interviewed at the Time of the Survey:</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Migrants (and %) of Migrants (Summary of Findings across and by Village)</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** 1. Each household interviewed was asked to indicate the reason for out-migration of the household head interviewed.
Level of education of migrants at the time of out-migration. Summary of findings across and by village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Number (and %) of Migrants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>Mumba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>15 (56)</td>
<td>6 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>12 (44)</td>
<td>7 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above secondary/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualification</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response/don't know</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 (100)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: 1. Each household interviewed was asked to indicate the level of education of the migrant(s) when he/she (they) left. If the household had many migrants then the level of education of each migrant was recorded until the levels of education for all migrants were recorded.

2. The no response/don't know included those that did not give responses and those who could not remember the level of Education of the migrant(s).

Source: Field data.
Appendix 5.2 continued

Distribution of village industry entrepreneurs by age, and, summary of responses to questions relating to labour supply (village industry entrepreneurs)
## Distribution of village industry entrepreneurs by age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Number of entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 years and less</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years and above</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Response to the question, (village industry entrepreneurs), 'Would you prefer to employ someone who is young or mature or old?'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of entrepreneurs</th>
<th>% of total number of entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young (19 years and less)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle aged (20-39 years)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old (40 years and above)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young and middle aged</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
Response to the question, (village industry entrepreneurs) 'When recruiting employees do you consider the level of education?'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of entrepreneurs</th>
<th>% of total number of entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Responses to the question, (village industry entrepreneurs) 'Do you have any problems in finding the labour force?'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of entrepreneurs</th>
<th>% of total number of entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
. Number of households receiving and not receiving remittances by village and household type

. Uses of remittances

. Rates of out-migration by household type
Number of household receiving and not receiving remittances by village and household type (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Household type</th>
<th>Households receiving remittances</th>
<th>Households not receiving remittances</th>
<th>Total number of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low income</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>high income</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all households</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>low income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all households</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>low income</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all households</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>low income</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all households</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>low income</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high income</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all households</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Household with an annual income of less than K2000.00 are referred to as "low income", and those with an annual income equal to K2000.00 or more as "high income"

Source: Field data
Use to which remittances were put (Figures in brackets are percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of remittances</th>
<th>Number of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household consumption/subsistence</td>
<td>14 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring labour and investment in agriculture</td>
<td>20 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply/not applicable i.e. did not receive remittances</td>
<td>96 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Rates or out-migration by household type (All villages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household type</th>
<th>Rates of out-migration</th>
<th>Household total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households with low out-migration rates (one or no absent household member)</td>
<td>Households with high out-migration rates (more than one adult member absent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key to interpretation of figures

1. First number is the count or number of households

2. Figures in brackets are percentages. The first value is the row percentage. The second is the column percentage.

\[
\chi^2 = 0.7918 \quad \text{df} = 1 \quad p = 0.3736
\]

\[
\text{Phi} = 0.07804 \\
\text{Pearson R} = -0.078
\]

3. Relationship is significant if \( P < 0.05, 01 \)

Source: Field data
Appendix 5.4

Source of cash used to establish village industries
Sources of cash used to establish village industries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of capital</th>
<th>Number of entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money saved while in town</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash savings within village</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan from bank/government</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant from institution</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of entrepreneurs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
Village industry entrepreneurs. Proportion who were return migrants and non-migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of entrepreneur</th>
<th>Number of entrepreneurs (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return migrant</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non migrant</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To number of entrepreneurs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Calculations on the significance of this distribution are given on the next page.

Source: Field data
BINOMIAL TEST

The foregoing table shows that, 9 out of 13 entrepreneurs are return migrants. Is this a significant difference?

H0: There is no significant difference in the number of entrepreneurs who are return-migrants and those who are non-migrants.

H1: More than half the entrepreneurs are migrants i.e. there is a significant difference.

A binomial test was appropriate because (1) the population was in two dichotomous categories, (2) the sample size is quite small and (3) the data are nominal (see Sharp, [1977:1770] more details).

A one-tailed test was used. Level of significance was set at .10 (For small samples, to decrease chances of making Type II error you set your level of significance at .10, see Sharp, [1977:177]).

DECISION RULE: If the calculated probability < significance level, reject H0

To compute probability of having 9 or more return-migrant entrepreneurs, a table with "Probabilities associated with values as small as the observed values of X for the binomial test" was used (see Sharp, (1977:355).

Decision rule: If .013 ≤ .10 reject H0

Conclusion: reject H0. The observed differences in the number of migrant and non-migrant entrepreneurs was significant.
Return migrants: number regarding themselves as having acquired, or not acquired skills useful in the village

Type of skills acquired by return migrants

Return migrants participation in various activities

Return migrants: reason for migrating to urban areas

Return migrants: length of time spent in urban areas

Distribution of village industry entrepreneurs and non-village industry entrepreneurs by type of education.

Return migrants: number regarding themselves as having acquired, or not acquired skills useful in the village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number acquiring useful skills</th>
<th>Number without useful skills</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total number of return migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Number of Migrants</th>
<th>Number of Skills in Education Business Leadership Technical</th>
<th>Type of Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitiramukulu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesituka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannapata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Villages</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Some useful technical skills to have acquired by migrants by migrants who claimed.**

**Total number of migrants by migrants who urban areas.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Migrants Before</th>
<th>Migrants After</th>
<th>Both but</th>
<th>With Stagn-</th>
<th>Both but</th>
<th>With Stagn-</th>
<th>Both but</th>
<th>With Stagn-</th>
<th>Both but</th>
<th>With Stagn-</th>
<th>Both but</th>
<th>With Stagn-</th>
<th>Both but</th>
<th>With Stagn-</th>
<th>Both but</th>
<th>With Stagn-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return migrants: numbers involved in local semi-skilled or skilled employment before or after migration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Total number of return migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Field data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Sign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Village

Reply of return

No number involved in some businesses (non-agricultural) before but after migration

Return migration numbers: numbers involved in same business (non-agricultural) before and after
Distribution of village industry entrepreneurs by type of education (Percentages in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of education</th>
<th>Number of entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>4 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above secondary/</td>
<td>2 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 (100)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Distribution of head of households (non-village industry entrepreneurs by type of education (Percentages in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of education</th>
<th>Number of household heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>34 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>75 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>18 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above secondary/</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130 (100)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Less than 1 Year</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>1 to 5 Years</th>
<th>6 to 10 Years</th>
<th>Over 10 Years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kannagan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neelukha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittumukhlu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return migrants: Length of time spent in urban areas (percentages in brackets)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chithimukhu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Migration to Urban Area</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration/Reintegrate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay with Cash</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return migrants: Responses to the question on reasons for migrating to urban areas. Summary of findings by village, (percentages in brackets).
Appendix 6.1

List of proposed village industries

The following list shows the kind of village industries which were considered to be suitable for development in Zambia. When the Village Industry Service was formed it was to direct its efforts to the promotion of research and development of village industries in the categories listed below.

(a) Food Processing

1. Oil extraction from soya beans, sunflower, groundnuts etc.

2. Fruit and vegetable preservation, bottling and drying.

3. Milled grains - maize, rice, wheat etc.

4. Dairy products

5. Smoked fish

6. Bee keeping and honey processing

(b) Wood and Textile Processing

1. Making paper and boards

2. Leather processing (tanning and shoe-making)

3. Furniture making

4. Toy making (wooden)

5. Basketry and mat making

6. Cloth weaving and tailoring

7. Making brooms and brushes
(c) **Metal and Chemical Processing**

1. Washing soap

2. Pottery and chalk making

3. Candles

4. Matches

5. Copper and other metal fabrication

6. Repair of farm implements

7. Lime kilns

8. Food storage granaries and bins

9. Building components:
   
   Brickmaking, cement/fibre roofing, clay based pipes for carrying water and drainage.

---

**Source:** Village Industry Service (VIS) Pamphlet
Appendix 6.2

THE VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION: NEWS AND NOTES IN BRIEF

BACKGROUND

The VDF was conceived and formed by a Mr. Thomas Chishimba under name Mungwi Village Industry Service (MVIS). By then Mr. Chishimba was a senior literacy officer with the Ministry of Labour and Social Services. The idea to form the MVIS was stimulated by his experience abroad (1972) vis-a-vis the youth organisations on self-help basis. In 1973 he wrote an open circular inviting heads of departments and church leaders to a meeting to create MVIS.

Initially Mr. Chishimba had in mind the youth as particular beneficiaries of the self-employment-oriented projects. By the time the organisation was formed the objectives had broadened to include:

(a) Promoting socio-economic development by initiating small-scale village industries in dressmaking, poultry, farming, vegetable growing, salt manufacturing, blacksmithing, carpentry, eating places, (restaurants), fish production and selling, soap production and other small-scale enterprises which may help to bring about the required development in rural areas.

(b) Providing employment opportunities to adults and young people.

(c) Providing goods and services in rural areas

(d) Promoting integrated development in villages to encourage self-reliance
ACTIVITIES OF THE (VDF)

The VDF has been operating in Kasama District in the following communities: Ntema in Kasama area; Kanyanta, Chinika, Chibile, Masela and Mtemba in Mungwi area.

In all these villages the projects are run on a cooperative basis and have a number of subsections. The main components include:

(a) farming where each member is encouraged to have a farm plot.

To increase agricultural productivity there is

(b) the literacy programme where members are taught to read and write.

The members are later given a book entitled "Limeni Iyanje Ishingi" which means "Grow more maize". The members are also given free note books and pencils for notes on improved farming methods. Finally, members are supplied with free inputs as part of the practical literacy programme. Other projects include (c) Preschools and (d) Homecraft for women. The latter includes tailoring, knitting and cooking. In addition there are also specialised projects in some villages. Examples include carpentry as in Kanyanta and insecticide manufacturing from tobacco in Mtemba village.

The co-operatives or clubs as they are sometimes called (VDF constitution, P2) are run on an integrated basis. There is in other words a linkage between various projects. For example, farm produce such as soya beans is sometimes sold to homecraft clubs which
process it into cakes and milk which are sold at tuckshops available at each centre. At Masela for example, there is a bakery and tuckshop. Here plans are to process locally grown wheat. Another example is the hammer mill in Kanyanta which is meant to process local grain grown by members. The mealie meal will then be sold at the local as well as other tuckshops. There is also the oxenization project where bulls are trained by officers employed by the VDF. The bulls are then sold to clubs to be used by club members as well as local villagers in ploughing their fields. The bulls are let on hire.

Other examples of integrated projects include the Mungwi Oil Project. Under this project an oil extraction plant has been built at Mungwi. This will process sunflower, soya beans and groundnuts from member clubs. The cooking oil will be sold at Mungwi retail shop and all club tuckshops. The VDF is giving more loans to farmers to encourage the production of the raw materials (sunflower, soya beans and groundnuts). Other projects include the Chibile Farming Project. Here a dam has been erected across Chibile stream to tap water for fish farming and irrigation of citrus fruits which will later be processed into jams.

In all the projects outlined above and many others not mentioned, the VDF provides the funds, extension services and qualified instructors until the projects become self-sustaining in terms of manpower and finance. The VDF also assists in the marketing of products where necessary.
Ultimately the aim is to turn all the projects into self-sustaining ventures. Once that stage is reached the co-operatives (clubs) will be affiliated to the Northern Province Co-operative Union (NCU) to enable them get loans from organisations such as CUSA (VDV constitution, p2). Once that stage is attained VDF will pull out and remain only with the task of monitoring the projects.

The projects outlined above have made notable contribution to the living conditions of the local people. Not only has food production increased in many family plots, the projects also seem to be attracting a number of young men and women which is in line with government policy. The clubs have also been encouraged to erect food stores to ensure a continuous supply of food particularly maize.

Source: 1. Field Interviews


Unpublished Paper


Unpublished Paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Self Employment Heads</th>
<th>Wage Employment Heads</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed Self</td>
<td>Unemployed Wage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heads</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittrumkuju</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsetanka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyarwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Appendix 6.3
Number of households with a member (other than the household head) in wage employment. Summary of findings by village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Households with a member in wage employment</th>
<th>Households without a member in wage employment</th>
<th>Total number of sampled households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Non-Government</th>
<th>Wage</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kanyanya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nseltka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Momba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chitilumkulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Source: Field data |

<p>| Nature of employment agency for household heads in wage employment |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source: Field data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All villages
Kanyanca
Metsuka
Mumua
Chiltimukulu
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neelukka</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittimukku</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Reason for Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Old age did not get pension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Old age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Old age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Old age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Old age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Old age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pension Receiving</td>
<td>Find a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash / Title</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old enough of town</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons and No migrant</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 6.5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Why did you decide to return to this village?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of findings by village

Return migrant’s response to the question: Why did you decide to return to this place?

Appendix 6.5
Appendix 6.5

Number (and %) of household heads who were migrants and non-migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Migrant</th>
<th>Non-Migrant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>15 (50)</td>
<td>15 (50)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>10 (33)</td>
<td>20 (67)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>18 (45)</td>
<td>22 (5)</td>
<td>40 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>9 (30)</td>
<td>21 (70)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>52 (40)</td>
<td>78 (60)</td>
<td>130 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
Appendix 6.6

Table 6.7 Household heads' Responses to the question: 'If more village industries are established do you think this will improve the living conditions of the people (Percentages in brackets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>'yes'</th>
<th>'no'</th>
<th>no reply</th>
<th>Total number of interviewed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>28 (93)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>29 (97)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>34 (85)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>4 (10)</td>
<td>40 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>26 (87)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>117 (90)</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td>9 (7)</td>
<td>130 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
Appendix 6.6

Table 6.8 Responses to the question on how village industries can improve life in the villages (Households who gave the 'yes' response to the question in Table 6.7)a. (Percentages in brackets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Will provide employment</th>
<th>Will provide goods and services and incomes to local people</th>
<th>Employment No reply</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitimukulu</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>20 (67)</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumba</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>20 (67)</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nseluka</td>
<td>8 (20)</td>
<td>20 (50)</td>
<td>6 (15)</td>
<td>6 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyanta</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>14 (47)</td>
<td>5 (47)</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages</td>
<td>23 (18)</td>
<td>74 (57)</td>
<td>20 (15)</td>
<td>13 (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Some respondents who had given 'no' to the first question (Table 6.7) did give responses to the question outlined above (Table 6.8). Most of these respondents were those that felt that in the first place the Government cannot establish a large number of village industries, but at the same time if more industries were established it is possible to improve the living conditions in the manner indicated in the Table.

Source: Field data.
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