

MIGRATION AND ADAPTATION TO THE CITY: A COMPARATIVE PROFILE OF RETURNEES AND STAYERS IN KOREA*

Lee On-Jook &
Kim Kyong-Dong

Comparing the characteristics and migration behavior of urban-rural returnees with those of rural out-migrants still residing in the city (stayers), a general assumption that urban-rural return migrants are selective, manifest distinct patterns of behavior, and undergo different modes of adaptation to the city, is examined. The data used were collected in a limited survey conducted in one rural county, two provincial cities, and in the capital city of Seoul, in the summer of 1977. The focus of analysis is on the comparative pattern and degree of adaptation to the city experienced by both returnees and stayers, with the result that the level of adaptation in terms of residential, occupational, economic, social, and psychological aspects has been generally lower among return migrants than urban stayers. Inclusion of female migrants in the analysis has confounded the findings to an extent, but not in any significant degree. Some selected pre-migration characteristics, migration decision and behavior patterns, as well as spatial-ecological aspects of migration history have also been compared between the two migrant groups, whereby it has been ascertained that they show some important differences in these regards. To examine some aspects of the consequences of urban-rural return migration, the two migrant groups are also compared with the non-migrant rural natives on several SES variables, allowing us to conclude that returnees stand in-between urban stayers and rural stayers. A few theoretical and policy implications of the findings are discussed in connection with rural development and population redistribution.

I. INTRODUCTION

The focus of this paper is on comparing urban-rural return migrants with those migrants who stay in the city, in terms of their socio-economic and psychological characteristics, migration behavior, and adaptation pattern in the urban destination. More specifically, it compares the socio-demographic characteristics of migrants when they first left the rural origin to move to the city, their reasons for initial rural out-migration, decision-making pattern and unit of move, migratory behavior, and various aspects of their adaptation to the city. This is done with a set of survey data gathered in Korea during the summer of 1977. But due to the small number of cases of female migrants, sampled, the data will be presented in a descriptive manner.

The general assumption guiding the study has been that urban-to-rural return migrants are

*This is a partial report of a project conducted under the sponsorship of the Ford-Rockefeller Foundations Population and Development Policy Research Program: 1977-78. A larger report has been published in a book form, based on the Ph.D. Dissertation submitted by On-Jook Lee to the Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, N.C., *Urban-to-Rural Return Migration in Korea* (Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1980). The authors are grateful to the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations for their financial support, and to Late Professor Lee Hae-Young and Dr. Kwon Tai-Hwan of the Population and Development Studies Center, Seoul National University, for their support for the field research. We also express our appreciation to so many students of the Department of Sociology, Seoul National University, whose names we cannot list here individually, for their field work and other assistance. Two graduate assistants were especially helpful, Messrs. Choi Tae-Ryong and Cho Byung-Hee.

persons with some distinct characteristics and that this type of migratory behavior manifests certain unique patterns. Of special theoretical interest is that return migrants experience difficulties in adapting to the urban environment. In other words, the degree of adaptation to the city would be one of the most significant factors related to the decision to return to the rural origin. Adaptation to the city, in turn, is affected by the individual characteristics and migratory behavior pattern of the migrants.

These general assumptions are predicated upon several theoretical perspectives either prevalent or currently emerging in the field of migration study in general or that of return migration in particular. *First*, the general theoretical notion that migration is selective and, therefore, return migration also is selective both at the place of rural origin and at the place of destination before return is examined (Lee, 1966; Chi and Bogan, 1974; Eldridge, 1964; 1965; Feindt and Browning, 1972; Simmons and Cardona, 1972; DaVanzo, 1977).

Second, migration involves decision-making and actual move. In this process, several different factors have been identified as significant. As decision-making entails information regarding the prospective destinations and their advantages and disadvantages compared to those of the place of origin, some studies have indicated the importance of availability and accuracy of information in return migration (Lianos, 1975; Shaw, 1975; DaVanzo, 1975). Suggestions also have been made about the role of primary groups in the decision making and actual migration process (Simmons and Cardona, 1972; Chi and Bogan, 1974; Shaw, 1975), but no clear findings have been offered as to their effect on return migration. Similar observations may be made regarding the role of migration history such as distance traveled or the length of urban residence, although their importance has been mentioned or studied by migration specialists (Myers et al., 1967; Glaser and Habers, 1974; Rodriguez, 1974; Shaw, 1975).

To provide some theoretical explanations involving these factors, it is speculated that the greater level of information about the prospective destination and the greater involvement of primary group members, especially within the family, in the decision-making and actual move entail a greater amount of social psychological and economic "investments" made in the move itself, as well as some socio-psychological and economic "costs" incurred in the process.

In other words, the migrant is put in a position in which he must make greater effort to avoid a repetition of such investments and costs incurred (DaVanzo, 1977). Similar arguments may be offered with respect to the distance of move and the length of stay in the city. For instance, it has been suggested that the probability of a migration between two places diminishes as distance increases (Shaw, 1975) and the longer one stays in the city the less likely is one to move again. This is because not only of the cumulative inertia created by the length of residence (Myers et al., 1967) but also due to incremental place utility (Pryor, 1976) and increased investment of location-specific capital (DaVanzo, 1977).

Third, the central concern in this study has been to investigate whether or not and how much, if any, the migrant's adaptive experience in the place of urban destination affects his chance of return to the place of origin. This is intended as an alternative to the conventional push-pull approach to migration, in general, and as an attempt to furnish a theoretical perspective more realistic than any extent yet on explaining why people return, in particular, especially when the return move means leaving a place which by any objective criteria would have much greater advantages.

In order to operationalize the concept of adaptation, a taxonomical scheme has been developed to classify it 1) in terms of objective *versus* subjective aspects of adaptation, 2) with respect to the substantive dimensions of adaptation, such as ecological-residential, occupational-economic, social-cultural, and psychological ones, and 3) incorporating the idea of sequential nature of adaptation (Benyei, 1960; Sensetock, 1969; Gordon, 1964; Rex and Moore, 1967; Richardson, 1967; Bar-Yosef, 1968; Nagata, 1969; Price, 1969; Breton, 1964;

Cronin, 1970, Eisenstadt, 1970).

More importantly, some explanatory scheme is also needed. Assuming that a low degree of adaptation to the urban environment and maintenance of strong attachment to the rural place of origin would act as one of the factors increasing the likelihood of return, three related theoretical-conceptual frameworks have been adopted. First is DaVanzo's concept of "location-specific capital" (1977). If one invests a greater amount of capital—in this case means not only purely economic capital like the real estate, job, etc., but also such non-economic ones as knowledge of the area, friendships, etc.—in a specific place, either the place of origin or destination, then the person is likely to make a move to wherever such investment is larger and cost incurred is smaller.

The second theoretical element implied in the adaptation approach is the psychological mechanism of cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1964; 1968). In the process of adaptation to a place, one may encounter some discrepancy between one's expectations or aspirations and the actual conditions in the situation, or one may feel dissatisfied with the result of the adjustive effort itself, and hence one is likely to look for an alternative place to move to. At this point, the migrant may be more inclined to choose a place where not only social and economic advantages exist but also where the "subjectively satisfying place utility" is greater (Pryor, 1976). This is the third conceptual guideline utilized here. In short, it is believed that the adaptation approach may be a step forward by offering some insight into the dynamic of return migration and the intervening processual aspects to the study of return migration.

In addition to these theoretical concerns, the present study has pursued some policy implications of urban-rural return migration in Korea in the time frame of the current study. While Korea has experienced the general trend of rural-to-urban migration causing severe problems both in the city and the farm, some return migration has been detected (UN-ESCAP, 1975). This new trend may be a reflection of the broader societal change accompanying rapid industrialization and economic growth experienced in the last decade and a half, or it may be a beginning of a new current of migration caused by the very process of industrialization. Either way, return migration from the city to the farm may have some significant implications with respect to population redistribution that seems to be badly needed and to the solution of labor force shortage problems in the agricultural sector (Pryor, 1974; DaVanzo, 1977).

II. THE DATA

From the outset, this was designed to be a limited survey with a restricted sample of respondents to be selected from predetermined areas in Korea. The sampling plan involved two major stages: the stratified cluster sampling of study areas, and systematic random sampling of individual respondents. A province farthest removed from Seoul, the capital of the country, and the most depressed in the nation was chosen with the rationale that to understand the nature of urban-rural return migration one should begin with a rural region which is not only farthest from the central city of the country geographically but also the most depressed economically. And further consideration needed was to compare return migration from large metropolitan areas with that from an intermediate city nearby. Within the rural area also, two types of communities have been included for comparison. One is a rural town which is the county seat, and the other covers a whole sub-county area with scores of small clustered farm villages. Despite this kind of careful sampling scheme followed, the final sample size has turned out to be disappointingly small, especially returnees, so that comparisons intended as indicated above have not been entirely made.

As for the individual sampling, we have aimed at 700 respondents altogether. These were to include 200 return migrants, 100 each in the county seat or rural township and in the farm villages in the same county; 300 rural out-migrants still residing in the city, 100 each in three

sample cities, i.e., Seoul, *Kwangju* or the provincial capital and the only metropolis in the province, *Sunchon* or the intermediate city near the rural county; and 200 rural natives, 100 each in the town and in the villages. In principle, the returnees also were to be confined to those who used to live and left the above three cities, although in practice we had to com-

Table 1. Summary Profile of Returnees, Out-Migrants and Non-Migrants by Sex

	Returnee		Out-Migrant		Non-Migrant	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. Present Age	(%)	(f)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
-19	2.8	1	.9	2.8	4.1	3.8
20-24	15.9	15	4.6	15.3	8.2	18.9
25-29	20.0	5	10.6	22.2	6.2	11.3
30-34	20.7	1	14.2	9.7	11.6	13.2
35-39	14.5	-	20.6	11.1	11.6	17.0
40-44	9.0	2	16.5	11.1	21.9	11.3
45-49	7.6	-	16.5	15.3	10.3	1.9
50-	9.6	-	16.0	12.5	26.0	22.6
Total	100.1	24	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0
Mean Age	33.7	24.9	39.7	35.5	41.4	36.8
Median Age	32.2	23.6	39.3	22.0	41.4	36.7
B. Present Marital Status	(%)	(f)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Single	40.0	20	13.5	25.0	15.8	22.6
Married	60.0	3	86.5	68.1	83.5	73.6
Other	-	1	-	2.8	-	3.8
No response	-	-	-	4.2	.7	-
C. Mean Years of Schooling Completed	9.8	11.8	10.5	8.0	7.8	7.6
D. Present Occupation						
Unemployed	24.8	13	8.7	52.8	6.6	30.2
Tenant farmer, farm laborer	1.4		-	-	6.1	7.6
Lower service worker, laborer	7.6		21.6	16.7	2.7	1.9
Operative	5.5	-	4.1	-	1.4	-
Owner-farmer	32.4	-	.5	-	49.3	39.6
Sales worker	.7	1	3.2	-	1.4	3.8
Skilled worker	1.4	-	4.6	-	4.1	-
Clerical worker	9.0	6	30.3	15.3	8.2	3.8
Administrative worker	13.8	-	15.1	9.7	15.1	11.3
Professional, technical worker	13.5	4	12.0	5.6	4.8	1.9
E. Level of Monthly Income						
Less than 20,000 Won	3.4	3	1.4	2.8	6.8	22.6
20,000-50,000 Won	17.9	1	11.5	15.3	30.8	30.2
50,000-100,000 Won	29.0	7	33.9	36.1	30.1	7.5
100,000-150,000 Won	13.1	1	22.9	25.0	15.8	15.1
150,000-200,000 Won	2.8	3	13.3	6.9	5.5	1.9
200,000 Won & over	20.0	2	13.8	11.1	6.2	-
No response	13.8	7	3.2	2.8	4.8	22.6
Number of Cases	(145)	(24)	(218)	(72)	(146)	(53)

promise due to the limited availability of return migrants in the rural area under study at the time of the field survey. Basically, the sampling of individual respondents was based on the Residential Registration Records obtained at the municipal or sub-county offices in each sample area. Since, however, the Records were found to be incomplete especially with respect to migrants, additional on-the-spot sampling had to be relied on. With this sort of compromise, it turned out that the number of return migrants was quite limited, especially female returnees. Of course, from the beginning, it was decided that the ratio between male and female respondents should be around 3 to 1, but female return migrants could not be found to reach even that ratio. Table 1 summarizes the profile of the respondents by sex.

Personal interviews were made by trained sociology students, all males, usually at home except for some rural residents who were interviewed in the field. Three separate sets of questionnaire or interview schedule were used, each designed specially for returnees, out-migrants, and rural natives. Elaborate computer analysis was made for the male respondents and reported in a separate publication (Lee, 1980). For the present paper which includes the female data, however, simple comparisons are made between returnees and stayers (out-migrants still in the city) by sex on various characteristics mentioned earlier. Due to the small size of the female respondents, as has been repeatedly indicated, no statistical analysis has been attempted. But the descriptive examination of the data will be made referring to the more detailed statistical analysis presented in the other publication. In other words, for whatever statistical significance implied in the following interpretations of the data, the basis is assumed to be provided in the separate report dealing only with the male respondents. Also to be noted is that in this paper the focus is on the comparative profile of returnees and stayers in terms of their migration behavior and adaptation pattern, and hence rural natives are basically left out of the analysis.

III. PRE-MIGRATION CHARACTERISTICS AND REASONS FOR RURAL OUT-MIGRATION

The most elementary yet important question in a migration study is whether or not migrants were already selective at their place of origin when they first left there, and if so how selective they were. For a study of return migration, this question has dual significance. First of all, it would alert us to the selectivity of returnees as past rural out-migrants, whether compared or not with the out-migrant stayers. More importantly, the second implication is that returnees were already selective at the place of rural origin at the time of their initial rural out-migration in such a way that might have affected their adaptation to the city later and eventually their decision to return to the rural origin.

According to the findings presented in Table 2 below, it is very clear that a large majority of migrants, both returnees and stayers, were indeed young, single, and unemployed when they first took off to the city. The great majority was in their late teens and early twenties, aspiring and mobile, especially when they were "unattached" in the sense of not having been married and burdened with family responsibilities. Furthermore, they were largely unemployed so that there was not much to lose but to gain by moving to the city. Of course, this set of findings nicely corroborate the general proposition that persons in their late teens, twenties, and early thirties are more migratory than their older counterparts (Shaw, 1975: 18).

What is more important, there are distinct variances between returnees and stayers, as well as between male and female migrants. Returnees, both men and women, were much younger than stayers already at the time of their rural out-migration and most of them were unmarried while the marital rate of stayers was much higher, especially female migrants. Even though the unemployment rate was similar, the level of occupational skill and status was much lower for return migrants than out-migrants, also for both sexes. In general, female migrants were

Table 2. Personal Characteristics of Migrants at the Time of Rural Out-Migration by Sex and Migration Status

Characteristics	Returnee		Out-Migrant	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
	(%)	(f)	(%)	(%)
A. Age				
-14	3.4	1	4.1	5.5
15-19	57.2	19	34.9	30.6
20-24	15.2	2	18.3	30.6
25-29	11.7	1	17.9	15.3
30-34	6.9	-	11.5	6.9
35-	5.6	-	13.4	11.1
Mean Age	20.5	17.8	24.1	22.7
Median Age	18.6	17.2	21.1	20.2
B. Marital Status				
Single	82.7	23	62.8	40.3
Married	16.6	1	36.3	57.4
No response	.7	-	.9	1.4
C. Occupation				
No job (incl. student)	60.0	22	64.2	83.3
Unskilled worker	5.6	-	3.2	1.4
Farmer	23.4	-	12.3	8.3
Skilled worker	6.2	1	2.8	2.7
Clerical worker	4.1	1	4.1	4.2
Managerial, administrative worker	.7	-	12.9	-
Professional, technical worker	-	-	.5	-
Number of Cases	(145)	(24)	(218)	(72)

younger than their male counterparts when they left the rural place of origin and their unemployment rate was much higher.

There are, however, some interesting variations to this general tendency. First, the mean and median age of female stayers were higher than that of male returnees. Moreover, almost six out of ten female outmigrants were already married at the time of rural out-migration, which not only stands out as a deviant pattern but is quite distinct from the fact that 23 out to 24 female returnees were still single when they left for town. These two sets of findings should be understood in context. As will be revealed partly in the next table, quite a few women stayers reported that they left the rural origin early in their life because of marriage. This exceeded the number of female out-migrants who left home for schooling purpose in their early life, too. Thus, one could draw an interesting conclusion from the above observations that returnees, especially women, were the youngest of all and most of them were single and unattached when they first moved out of their place of rural origin. The implication of this observation for return migration seems already suggested: returnees were potentially mobile and less committed to the urban destination than their counterparts, namely stayers in the city.

These observations are partly supported by the data on the stated reasons for rural out-migration as reported by the respondents. For this purpose, we have also presented data on the reasons for non-migration on the part of rural natives who have been living in the study area for life. The three dimensional approach to reasons for migration has been devised by the authors specifically for this study as a classificatory scheme. The first dimension deals with the push or pull reasons from the perspective of whether the prospective destination attracted

the migrant or the origin was repulsive to the migrant or the move itself was rather obligatory in nature where the choice was not with the migrant him/herself. With the same response, then, the second dimension was examined mainly looking into the affective nature of the stated reasons. Finally, the substantive reasons given were classified according to the conventional categories of economic, occupational, educational, familial-social and the like. For the non-migrant, of course, the reasons given are for non-migration. In this case, attraction means pulls in the origin and repulsion stands for pushes from the city. And the data on the non-migrant are merely presented for comparison.

The findings appearing in Table 3 indeed reflect the personal characteristics of the migrants and natives. For instance, for returnees of both sexes attractions, imagined or real, in the city were the single most important reasons they thought they were pulled by in their initial rural out-migration. Although attractive reasons were more important than others even for out-migrant stayers, obligatory reasons were also important, particularly in the case of female stayers. Repulsion in the city, on the other hand, played a slightly larger role in the decision not to leave the rural origin for non-migrant rural natives.

Table 3. Stated Reasons for Rural Out-Migration Compared with Those for Non-Migration by Sex and Migration Status

Reason	Returnee		Out-Migrant		Non-Migrant	
	Male (%)	Female (f)	Male (%)	Female (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
A. Push-Pull Dimension^{a)}						
Attractive	85.4	23	59.7	47.2	35.2	39.6
Repulsive	8.3	—	14.2	5.6	54.1	41.5
Obligatory	4.9	1	24.6	45.8	5.7	11.3
Other	1.4	—	1.4	1.4	4.9	7.6
B. Affectivity Dimension						
Affective	15.3	1	3.3	4.2	18.0	15.1
Practical	77.8	23	69.7	51.4	69.7	62.3
Obligatory	6.2	—	25.1	43.1	9.0	15.1
Other	.7	—	1.9	1.4	3.3	7.6
C. Substantive Dimension						
Economic	16.0	—	13.3	9.7	32.0	15.1
Occupational	31.9	7	44.6	29.2	34.4	37.7
Educational	31.9	15	30.3	23.6	1.6	—
Familial-Social	4.2	2	5.2	32.0	18.0	22.7
General attraction	13.2	—	3.8	4.2	9.8	17.0
Other	2.8	—	2.8	1.4	4.1	7.6
Number of Cases	(144)	(24)	(211)	(72)	(122)	(53)

a) In the case of non-migrant rural natives, attraction means that in the origin, and repulsion, that in the city.

As for the affectivity dimension, practical reasons do stand out for all the categories of respondents. Yet, for female out-migrants, their importance again diminishes in favor of obligatory reasons. One might begin to wonder why. The answer partially lies in the next dimension dealing with the substance of reasons. Here, we find more interesting distinctions between groups. First, education and job opportunity were the most important pulls for male returnees. Note, however, that general attractions also were significant for this group, much more so than any other. Second, education stands out as the single most important reasons

for out-migration in the case of female return migrants. Third, occupation was the most immediate reasons for male out-migrants, though education also was important for this group. Fourth, it is remarkable to note that for female stayers, familial-social reasons occupied the top rank followed by job and schooling. And finally, while economic-occupational reasons were important to both male and female natives, familial-social reasons did play a heavy part, too, particularly for female natives, relative to all other groups except for female out-migrants.

It is in this context that we refer back to the significance of personal socio-demographic characteristics of the migrant in understanding the motivational tendencies and their effect upon the ensuing mobility. Take, for example, return migrants. They took off to the city with the hope that the prospective destination offers practical attractions for educational and occupational opportunities. Some even had vague dreams of striking big in the city. They were young, unmarried, and largely unemployed when they made this decision and move, as has already been discussed earlier. Out-migrant stayers, on the other hand, were also young and mobile and they also were looking for opportunities for more schooling and job and other economic gains. Nonetheless, obligation took a much larger part in this case. Many were drawn to the city on account of job transfer or family move. Familial-social reasons found to be so important in the case of female out-migrants were in fact mostly their marriage to a person living in the city, plus they left for town with the family when they were school girls.

Non-migrant rural natives were mostly in their late thirties in the case of female respondents and in the early forties in the case of male informants, on the average, that is. The largest hunk of these people were in effect in their fifties or over. This, no doubt, directly reflects the selectivity of migration and the labor shortage of farming areas. At any rate, under the circumstances, they could not make hasty move because they certainly did not have much to hope for in the city while something to lean on was still there at home. In addition, they had families and other social-familial responsibilities to take up in the place where they were living at the time of study.

Thus far, the data suggest that return migrants are not only selective at the place of rural origin already at the time of initial rural out-migration. But they also are distinct in their motivational orientations. And these distinct characteristics of these individuals must have contributed to their later return move. Having been young, unmarried, and unemployed, they jumped the village looking for the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, merely to find disappointment and frustration. Stayers, on the other hand, were not only older than returnees, but more of them were "committed" and "attached" by marriage, employment, or otherwise. They were already investing greater amounts of social and psychological capital in their rural out-migration. They had to adapt better to the urban environment than returnees, and hence persistence to stay in the city. Whether the same argument holds throughout the process of migration and adaptation will presently be examined.

IV. PREPARATION AND MIGRATION

It has been ascertained in the above discussion that return migrants were already selective at the time of initial rural out-migration, with respect not only to their personal socio-demographic characteristics but also to their motivational inclinations. It could follow, then, that their migration behavior also manifests certain distinct patterns or is affected by some differential definition of the situation. In this section, we explore this aspect of return migration. Included in the following comparison of returnees and stayers are the differential level of information about the prospective destination before making the decision to leave the origin, the decision-making agent, the unit of move, mean number of migration, the pattern of migration involving stepwise move, the size of community first migrated to, and the mean length of residence in the place of urban destination.

According to Table 4, it appears that female migrants in general had a lower level of prior information regarding the prospective destination than their male counterparts. Among male migrants, however, returnees had less command of prior information about the destination than stayers. The fact that female migrants, particularly stayers, were less versed with the conditions about the prospective destination could be explained partly by their reasons for out-migration, namely that they had to leave for obligatory, familial reasons. As for the returnees, on the other hand, their age and marital status seems to have had some effect on the level of information they commanded at the time of out-migration from the rural place of origin.

Table 4. Factors Related to Decision-making and Actual Move in the Process of Rural Out-Migration by Sex and Migration Status

Variables	Returnee		Out-Migrant	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. Level of Prior Information about Destination				
	(%)	(f)	(%)	(%)
No or little information	62.0	14	42.7	65.3
Some prior information	24.2	10	23.4	22.2
Well versed	13.1	—	23.8	11.1
No response	.7	—	10.1	1.4
B. Decision-making Agent				
Self	52.4	1	37.2	25.0
Spouse	6.2	1	17.4	27.8
Parent	31.0	22	29.4	36.1
Other	10.0	—	9.6	8.3
No response	—	—	6.4	2.8
C. Unit of Move				
By oneself	86.2	18	52.8	25.0
With part of family	6.9	4	47.9	20.8
Whole family	6.9	2	—	47.2
No response	—	—	—	7.0
Number of Cases	(145)	(24)	(218)	(72)

This, however, could be better understood if we look at the decision making agent and the unit of move. In the case of female migrants, the involvement of family members, particularly parents, and spouses for stayers, was much greater than male migrants. As for male migrants, however, the degree of family involvement was greater for stayers than returnees. The difference between returnees and stayers is more consistent with respect to the unit of move. In the case of both male and female returnees, the proportion of individual move is much greater than either male or female stayers. And almost half of female stayers moved with the whole family, which reflects that they moved due to marriage and other familial reasons.

The above findings force us to re-think about our earlier conclusion regarding these factors, as reported in a separate publication (Lee, 1980). It was concluded that returnees had less command of information about the prospective destination, made the decision by oneself, and moved alone. But when the female migrants are included in the analysis, qualifications are necessary. First, female out-migrants had much less prior information when they left the origin. Second, female returnees mostly depended on their parental decision for the move. And third, majority of female stayers left with the family in part or as a whole. In order to

explain away some of these complications, one may have to consider two major factors. On the one hand, a majority of female out-migrant stayers had to move because they either were married away or moved with the family which had to leave the origin for occupational or other reasons. This could partly explain the low level of information they commanded, the high involvement of the family in their decision-making, and the high proportion of family move over against individual move. On the other hand, as for the only exception in the case of female returnees with regard to the strong parental involvement in the decision-making, it should be noted that most of them were unmarried students in their teens largely motivated by the educational needs for themselves and their brothers and sisters. Also note that this decision-making factor did not stand the test of regression analysis when information and unit of move were entered in the equation together, in the previous analysis of male data.

Theoretically, we claimed that low command of information, decision-making without the involvement of primary group members, and individual migration without the family all contributed to the lower degree of adaptation to the urban environment, thus to the eventual return. This was due to the low level of investment and commitment to the destination and to the move itself, and the low command of information caused inadequate definition of the situation, which required redefinition and adjustment to the cognitive dissonance created by the wrong move they made (DaVanzo, 1977; Festinger, 1964; 1968; Pryor, 1976). Findings presented above do not require any drastic modification of the argument itself, taking into account the other factors such as reasons for move and age, as we did above, however. Therefore, the empirical generalizations we formulated in the separate report still hold, with due qualifying explanations.

Once they decided to move, how they made the move is the next area to be considered. The spatial-ecological aspect of migration behavior has been regarded as one of the central concerns of migration study and some theoretical suggestions have been made thus far. For instance, the more frequently one moves, the greater the propensity to move (Shaw, 1975). As for the mode of migration and the size of community people first move to, the only theoretical guideline available suggests that the probability of a migration between two places diminishes as distance increases (Shaw, 1975). And finally, the longer one stays in one place, the less likely is one to move again (Myers et al., 1967; Glaser and Habers, 1974; Rodriguez, 1974).

In the other report on male respondents only, it has been ascertained that returnees in general moved more often than the stayers, more of them made a direct move to a larger community, but lived a shorter period of time in the urban places (Lee, 1980). When female migrants are compared, these general observations are consistently supported. If we look at the data presented in Table 5, the mean number of migration is larger for returnees than for stayers, both male and female, even though there is no difference between female returnees and male out-migrant stayers. As for the stepwise or direct pattern of move, the generalization still holds even after female migrants are compared. In fact, the proportion of direct move increases in the case of female returnees. The fact that it also is larger than male migrants in the case of stayers as well merely reflects their reasons for initial rural out-migration, i.e., marriage and family reasons.

The size of community migrants first moved to is much larger for returnees than out-migrant stayers, both male and female, supporting the earlier generalization we drew from the detailed analysis of male migrants. This of course is closely related to the mode of migration, whether direct or stepwise. If one moved stepwise, one had to move a shorter distance to a smaller-sized community than in the case of direct move to a larger community under study. Then, finally, it has been more strongly supported by the findings from female respondents that the longer they stayed in the city, the less likely they moved again, or return to the origin in this case.

As has been suggested above, the theoretical implications of these findings appear to

Table 5. Spatial-Ecological Aspects of Out-Migration and Migration History of Migrants by Sex and Migration Status

Variables	Returnee		Out-Migrant	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. Mean Number of Migration	2.96	2.29	2.30	1.80
B. Stepwise Move in the Process of Out-Migration	(%)	(f)	(%)	(%)
Stepwise move	13.1	3	31.7	26.4
Non-stepwise move	84.8	21	67.4	72.2
No response	2.1	—	.9	1.4
C. Size of Community First Migrated to				
Rural village	—	—	3.7	13.9
Small town, city with less than 100,000 people	2.1	—	15.1	11.1
Medium city (100,000–500,000)	11.0	2	22.5	29.2
Large city (500,000–1 million)	29.0	—	29.8	1.4
Metropolitan area (1 million +)	57.2	22	28.0	43.0
No response	.7	—	.9	1.4
D. Mean Length of Urban Residence (Year)	4.28	3.62	8.88	11.0
Number of Cases	(145)	(24)	(218)	(72)

include the following: first, migration propensity of returnees is greater than stayers; second, by making a direct move to a large community (with perhaps little or no prior information about it), returnees must have experienced a greater amount of cognitive dissonance; third, by living a shorter period of time in urban places they must have made less amount of social, economic, and psychological investments in the places of urban destination than stayers who have lived there much longer. Now, it is our task to demonstrate these ideas by examining the mode and degree of adaptation to the urban destination.

V. ADAPTATION TO THE URBAN LIFE AND THE RETURN MOVE

Adaptation has been studied mostly in the context of international migration, primarily dealing with assimilation, acculturation, and integration of migrants to the new society. Only a limited number of studies have treated this aspect in the field of return migration, even within the area of international migration, either theoretically (Goldlust and Richmond, 1974) or empirically (Cerese, 1974; Hernandez-Alvarez, 1967; Lianos, 1975; Myers and Masnick, 1968; Rodriguez, 1974; Toren, 1975; 1976). Thus, it has been a new attempt on our part to incorporate rather fully the role of adaptation to the urban environment in the destination in explaining urban-rural return migration within the context of a single society (Lee, 1980; Kim and Lee, 1979).

Two kinds of elements have been suggested as the new attempt. First, return migration has been understood in the context of the sequential flow of migration behavior or migration history, beginning with pre-migration characteristics and preparation, migration process itself, through adaptation to the city, all the way to the process of return and consequences. This type of sequential approach has rarely been tried in the field. Second, adaptation to the urban life has been the focus of analysis in explaining return migration. In doing this, we have adopted a few theoretical-conceptual models including the theory of cognitive dissonance, the

concepts of location-specific capital and subjectively satisfying place utility, as presented in a summary in the introductory section, and more fully in the other report (Lee, 1980).

The basic purpose of this sequential, adaptation approach is to overcome the shortcomings of the apparently economically biased, limited scope of the so-called push-pull approach. The adaptation approach not only provides a more realistic assumption than the push-pull approach. It also relates the selectivity aspect of migration theories to the process of migration. In addition, this approach incorporates the various suggestive ideas developed thus far in the studies of migrant adaptation, specifically the sequence and stages of adaptation involving different aspects of adaptation.

Thus, in our study, we have developed a working scheme distinguishing the aspects of adaptation into four major categories, such as, ecological-residential, occupational-economic, social-cultural, and psychological ones. Originally, occupational and economic aspects were separately analyzed, but in this particular work they are combined due to the limitations of the data. Of these four, the first three deal with mostly "objective" and structural aspects, while the last has to do with "subjective" adaptation. These are understood as roughly representing the sequential stages. One has to settle down first before taking a job and making money. Then, in the meantime, one makes friends and acculturates oneself in the new environment. If one feels at home and subjectively identified with the destination, one is assumed to be assimilated into the new setting.

Logically, it has been assumed, on the basis of some previous studies of international return migration, that urban-rural return migration must involve more than mere occupational-economic reason and social-psychological adaptation must play a much more significant role than has been assumed in the very vaguely formulated push-pull approach. This is because the places of origin these returnees move back to happen to be one of the most depressed regions of the country, thus rendering any "objective" comparisons of the situations rather unrealistic for the decision to return to the origin. To provide an explanation for this type of behavior, then, we need an angle like adaptation and theoretical schemes that could back up this new approach. As has been mentioned earlier, and been confirmed in the other report (Lee, 1980), it has been assumed that the lower the degree of adaptation to the urban life in the destination, the greater the likelihood of return to the origin.

Now, looking at the data of both sexes this time, the picture seems to generally support our assumption. Beginning with Table 6, we find that returnees in general had a bit greater difficulty in adaptation residentially. Of course, the full data with both sexes complicate the picture a little bit, too. The complication mainly is caused by inclusion of female returnees in the comparison. While their number is so limited, the proportion changes drastically and causes the complication.

More specifically, the proportion of migrants who first moved to a squatter area is largest among male returnees, followed by female stayers, male stayers, and no female returnees ever lived in a squatter area. The proportion of those who settled in a regular residential neighborhood is greatest among female returnees, followed by male stayers, female stayers, and male returnees, on the other hand. The exception here seems to be the female returnee group which happens to be consisted of young student or single girls moved to the city with family, for educational purposes of themselves or other family members, as has been already pointed out above. Otherwise, it appears that return migrants fared still slightly worse than stayers in this respect.

As for the degree of familiarity with the neighborhood first reached, the earlier pattern identified for the male respondents seems to hold even when female migrants are included. It was stayers who came first to a neighborhood where there were more strangers than friends or relatives. This was explained partly by one important fact that has not really been demonstrated by our findings, but detected on a more impressionistic basis. It happens that the

Table 6. Ecological-Residential Adaptation of Migrants at the Urban Destination by Sex and Migration Status

Variables	Returnee		Out-Migrant	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. Type of Neighborhood First				
Settled in the Destination	(%)	(f)	(%)	(%)
Squatter area	9.7	—	5.0	8.4
Non-residential community	18.6	3	12.8	15.3
Residential neighborhood	71.0	21	80.3	73.6
No response	.7	—	1.8	2.8
B. Degree of Familiarity with the First Settled Neighborhood				
All strangers	4.28	5	58.7	52.8
Some old friends	19.3	5	11.0	4.6
Some relatives	26.9	13	21.1	29.2
Some old neighbors from the origin	9.6	1	7.3	11.1
No Response	1.4	—	1.8	1.4
C. Transient Residence and Time Needed to Settle				
Temporary residence; took more than 1 year	2.8	6	9.6	9.7
Temporary residence; took less than 1 year	18.6	2	13.8	9.7
Settled down at once	71.7	16	70.6	76.4
No response	6.9	—	6.0	4.2
D. Ownership of First Residence				
Boarding	46.9	12	17.0	6.9
Monthly rent	20.0	5	28.0	31.9
Long-term lease	24.1	3	34.4	37.5
Own home	7.6	4	14.7	22.2
No response	1.4	—	6.0	1.4
Number of Cases	(145)	(24)	(218)	(72)

squatter area and most non-residential communities are occupied by people who draw others from the same origin or with some blood relations or other connections. It was in this type of neighborhood that returnees clustered relative to stayers. As for the time needed to settle down in the permanent residence, it was female migrants that moved immediately to their own residence in comparison with males. Thus, no significant difference is found between stayers and returnees in this regard.

The most remarkable difference between returnees and stayers, both male and female, may be noted with respect to ownership of the first residence. While majority of all the migrants did not own the home where they first lived in while in the city, the proportion of those who owned the home was much larger for out-migrant stayers than returnees, regardless of their sex. Although the difference between the two migrant groups was significant on all of the above variables when male migrants only were compared, the inclusion of female migrants seems to diminish this difference, except for the last variable, namely, ownership of the home they first lived in. Thus, it may be tentatively concluded that the group difference in residential adaptation appears only in terms of ownership of their home, which partly reflects their relative

economic adaptation, of course.

In this connection, one should be alerted to the personal characteristics and migration history of the migrants under study. In the detailed analysis reported in the other publication (Lee 1980), it was found that the type of neighborhood in which they first settled down was related to the size of community to which they first moved. In other words, those who migrated directly to a larger city tended to settle down in a nonresidential neighborhood. On the other

Table 7. Occupational-Economic Adaptation at the Urban Destination by Sex and Migration Status

Variables	Returnee		Out-Migrant	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. First Job at the Urban Destination				
	(%)	(f)	(%)	(%)
No job (incl. student)	24.8	13	11.0	87.5
Unskilled worker	22.1	3	23.3	4.2
Farmer	.7	—	2.3	—
Skilled worker	31.7	1	8.3	1.4
Clerical worker	11.0	6	31.6	2.8
Managerial, administrative worker	6.2	1	13.4	2.8
Professional, technical worker	3.5	—	10.1	—
No response	—	—	—	1.4
B. Last Job at the Urban Destination				
No job	17.2	19	8.7	52.8
Unskilled worker	12.3	—	21.6	16.7
Farmer	—	—	.5	—
Skilled worker	42.1	1	11.9	—
Clerical worker	9.7	4	30.3	15.3
Managerial, administrative worker	14.5	—	15.1	9.7
Professional, technical worker	4.2	—	12.0	5.6
C. Savings while in the city				
None	80.0	13	47.3	45.8
Some	20.0	11	52.7	41.4
No response	—	—	—	2.8
D. Membership in Mutual Financing Associations				
None	84.9	14	57.8	40.3
Had membership	15.1	6	42.2	58.3
No response	—	4	—	1.4
E. Debts at the Urban Destination				
None	64.1	22	43.6	38.9
Some	35.2	2	45.1	59.7
No response	.7	—	2.3	1.4
F. Monthly Income while in the city				
Less than 20,000 Won	9.0	—	1.4	2.8
20,000–49,999 Won	41.4	9	11.5	15.3
50,000–99,999 Won	20.7	3	33.9	36.1
100,000–149,999 Won	6.9	2	22.9	25.0
150,000 Won and over	4.1	2	27.1	18.0
No response (inapplicable)	17.9	8	3.2	2.8
Number of Cases	(145)	(24)	(218)	(72)

hand, those who were married at the time of out-migration and moved to the city as a family unit tended to own the first home in the place of urban destination, as well. These findings should be incorporated when the complications caused by inclusion of female migrants to be understood, particularly the case of female out-migrant stayers.

Occupational adaptation has been found to be a much more difficult phenomenon to be measured or interpreted. As Table 7 shows, both returnees and stayers have undergone some upward occupational mobility except for female returnees. This mobility is most starkly experienced, according to these data, by female stayers. In the case of female returnees, downward mobility is clearly detected in the course of urban living. Both returnees and stayers, in the case of males, have shown some upward mobility and in fact the relative mobility has been greater for returnees rather than stayers.

If one tries to understand these facts, one is slightly baffled. As for female migrants, the experience of upward occupational mobility on the part of stayers and that of downward mobility on the part of returnees could be interpreted as an indication of the differential occupational adaptation. However, male returnees apparently have experienced relatively more upward mobility than stayers, at least according to the figures shown in the table. Then, one could ask why return? One could offer only impressionistic insights into this matter. First, note that much more of returnees started as unemployed or in unskilled work than stayers. Second, some qualitative indepth observation including the reasons for return to be presented shortly tells us that many of male returnees left the place of urban destination to return to the place of origin on account of dissatisfaction with their job situation. To be added to this interpretation is another qualitative observation that these returnees had rather vague but high aspirations about the prospective destination in the first place when they took off from the rural origin.

It is in the economic aspect of adaptation, which may be assumed to reflect both of the above aspects of adaptation, i.e., residential and occupational, that we find distinct group differences, even after female migrants are included in the comparison. Considering both male and female respondents, more of out-migrant stayers had savings or membership in mutual financial associations, debts in the city, and a higher level of monthly family income than returnees. If one could readily follow the logic that more savings or involvement in mutual financial associations would be conducive to permanent residence, the implication of debts may seem a bit puzzling. We think that the same principle is at work even in this case. In a rather negative sense, debts would act as a holding force making it difficult to leave it behind. Of course, one could argue that the burden of debts means economic failure. But the adaptation approach exactly is trying to avoid the simple dichotomy of migrant's success or failure as the pull or push in return migration. Rather, even debts may be a factor inducing attachment to the urban environment, or negative "capital" invested in the city.

For the social aspect of adaptation, we have examined two sub-aspects: one dealing with the degree of attachment to the origin; and the other having to do with the degree of attachment to the destination. For the first sub-aspect, frequency of contact with three different kinds of people was compared, while the number of new friends made in the destination was used for the second sub-aspect. According to the data shown in Table 8, a clear pattern seems to be readily detected. This pattern emerges particularly with respect to the frequency of contact with old neighbors from the place of origin currently living in the place of destination and the number of new friends made at the place of destinations.

While the proportion of those who make frequent contact with old neighbors from the origin is larger among returnees, both male and female, that of those who made more new friends in the city is larger among stayers, especially male out-migrants. In other words, returnees tend to keep contacting people from the origin whereby their attachment to the place of origin is maintained, on the one hand. On the other hand, stayers must have striven to make more new friends in the place of destination, thus committing themselves more to the destina-

Table 8. Social Adaptation of Migrants at the Urban Destination by Sex and Migration Status

Variables	Returnee		Out-Migrant	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. Frequency of Visit to Rural Origin while in the City				
	(%)	(f)	(%)	(%)
Never	17.2	4	11.5	15.3
Up to several times a year	53.8	8	67.9	63.9
Once a month or more	26.9	12	18.3	19.4
No response	2.1	—	2.3	1.4
B. Contact with Relatives at the Destination				
No relatives	26.2	5	17.9	19.5
Rare contact	22.7	4	27.5	30.5
Frequent contact	48.3	15	50.9	50.0
No response	2.7	—	3.7	—
C. Contact with Old Neighbors from Origin Living in the Destination				
None around	50.3	13	36.7	56.9
Rare contact	16.6	1	29.8	19.4
Frequent contact	31.0	10	28.9	22.2
No response	2.1	—	4.6	1.4
D. New Friends Made at the Destination				
No new friends	18.6	6	6.9	20.8
Some	35.9	12	41.3	40.3
Quite a few	42.8	6	49.5	38.9
No response	2.7	—	2.3	—
Number of Cases	(145)	(24)	(218)	(72)

tion.

The same pattern does not show in the case of the frequency of visit to the place of origin and the frequency of contact with relatives residing in the place of destination. Rather, urban stayers tend to visit the origin slightly more often than returnees, and they also make more contact with relatives in the city. This should be understood in context, again. Regular visit to the place of origin has been a traditional custom in Korea, especially for those who have migrated from rural areas. The New Year's Day, August Moon, and several other occasions call for a visit to the ancestral tombs to pay homage to the deceased ancestors and to get together with the kinship members. For this purpose, we expect little difference between those who migrated to the city permanently or temporarily. Also, as for the contact with relatives in the city, it should be noted that those relatives in the city may not be necessarily from the identical place of rural origin and may have lived in the city all along. Here again, one could hardly expect any significant differential due to the fact that migrants are stayers or eventual returnees.

Whether it is residential, occupational, economic, or social adaptation, these are more or less "objective" aspects of adaptation. As some theories have argued, and as our earlier analysis of male migrants have indicated, it is the psychological, subjective satisfaction and "identification" with the new environment in the city that counts heavily in deciding whether to stay in or leave the place of destination. For comparison of this aspect, several dimensions have been examined, as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Psychological Adaptation of Migrants at the Urban Destination by Sex and Migration Status

Variables	Returnee		Out-Migrant	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. Original Intention to Stay at the Urban Destination When First Moved	(%)	(f)	(%)	(%)
Intended to leave, back to origin	29.0	4	22.0	15.3
Intended to stay permanently	53.8	10	35.8	54.2
Other	6.9	10	32.1	25.0
No response	10.3	—	10.1	5.6
B. Regret about Rural Out-Migration				
Regret the move	24.8	6	7.3	1.4
Neither regretful nor happy	31.7	7	37.6	52.8
Happy about the move	41.4	9	53.7	41.7
No response	2.1	2	1.4	4.2
C. Relative Feeling of Intimacy with New Friends at the Destination vs. those at the Origin				
No new friends	15.9	6	3.2	16.7
Felt closer to old friends in the origin	54.5	9	34.4	19.4
About the same	9.7	2	24.8	25.0
Felt closer to new friends at the destination	17.2	6	33.5	31.9
No response	2.8	1	4.1	6.9
D. Extent of Feeling at Home at the Destination				
Always had longing for the origin	65.5	10	50.5	28.7
Felt at home for neither place	16.6	8	19.7	12.5
Felt at home for the destination	14.5	6	28.4	55.6
No response	3.4	—	1.4	4.2
E. Perceived Living Conditions at the Urban Destination Relative to Those at the Origin				
Better in the rural origin	42.1	6	26.1	29.2
Little difference	20.0	10	32.6	30.6
Better at the urban destination	33.8	6	39.4	40.3
No response	4.1	2	1.8	—
F. Level of Satisfaction with Life at the Urban Destination				
Very dissatisfied	9.0	—	5.0	12.5
A little unhappy	29.7	5	19.7	15.3
Neither happy nor satisfied	19.3	9	35.3	34.7
Relatively happy	37.9	9	35.3	29.2
Very happy	3.4	1	3.7	5.6
No response	.7	—	.9	2.8
Number of Cases	(145)	(24)	(218)	(72)

To begin with the original intention to stay permanently in the place of destination at the time of migration, there have been some confusions in the previous studies as to the role of this intention in migration. In the first place, the original intention often has been included in the definition of migrant types such as returnees or stayers (Richmond, 1967). Secondly, it has been generally assumed that people will act according to their original intention. It has been found in our analysis, however, that the original intention does not necessarily come true. More returnees rather than stayers reported that they initially intended to stay permanently in the place of destination, at least at the time when they first moved to the city. Note, however, that there is an exception. In the case of female out-migrant stayers, that proportion is slightly larger than even male returnees. This again should be understood in connection with their reasons for migration, marriage and family obligations. In short, the original intention does not have any significant effect on the decision to return.

Whether or not one intended to stay for good in the city, migrants show quite significant differences in terms of their psychological feelings about the move and the places of origin and destination. The proportion of those who felt regrettable about the move is much larger among returnees than stayers regardless of sex. Moreover, much larger percentages of urban stayers have expressed closer feelings to the new friends made in the destination relative to those old friends in the place of origin, and have reported they have felt at home in the place of destination rather than longing for the place of origin. While this tendency is consistent for both sexes, one remarkable fact is that more than half of female stayers have expressed their feeling at home in the destination.

The same holds for the relative perception of life conditions in the place of destination *versus* rural origin. While in the city, more of returnees have felt the conditions in the rural origin were better than those in the urban destination, while the reverse was true for stayers. Nevertheless, one interesting contradiction is observed in the case of the general level of satisfaction with life at the urban destination. About four out of ten among not only male returnees but also among female stayers have expressed dissatisfaction with life in the city, whereas about four out of ten returnees, both male and female, and male stayers have expressed satisfaction. This particular finding may have to be interpreted to indicate that the general level of satisfaction with life at a certain place of residence at a certain point of time may not necessarily determine the act of return migration. It may be that those who are relatively satisfied in general still could want to leave or those who feel relatively dissatisfied may still want to stay. It is the relative commitment and identification that seems to be important in the decision to migrate rather than the simple level of general satisfaction with life at a place.

In order to help understand the above picture of the role of adaptation in return migration, let us now consider the shift in the relative emphasis of reasons for initial rural out-migration over against those for return migration, in the case of returnees only. Table 10 contains this information, comparing the proportion of different categories of reasons for out-migration with those for return. To start with the push-pull dimension of reasons, the most remarkable fact is that while it was attractions in the city that pulled them out of the place of rural origin, the most heavily considered reason for return to the origin now came to be repulsions from the city. The difficulty of adapting to the urban environment is clearly reflected in this finding.

What then were the major repulsions that pushed them out of the urban destination? From the affectivity perspective, it was mostly practical reasons that propelled them to take off from the rural origin. When they decided to return, the relative importance of affective reasons became much greater, especially for female returnees. Thus, one can detect the significance of psychological, subjective adaptation in the decision to return. Substantively, then, the shift takes place from the emphasis on education-occupation-economy, to occupation-economy-family. If we combine the above observations, we can make some sense out of the picture presented thus far.

Table 10. Stated Reasons Compared for Initial Rural Out-Migration and for Return: Returnees Only by Sex

Reason	for Out-Migration		for Return	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. Push-Pull Dimension				
	(%)	(f)	(%)	(%)
Attractive	85.4	23	32.4	7
Repulsive	8.3	—	57.2	7
Repulsive	8.3	—	57.2	15
Obligatory	4.9	1	8.9	1
Other	1.4	—	1.4	1
B. Affectivity Dimension				
Affective	15.3	1	36.6	10
Practical	77.8	23	54.5	11
Obligatory	6.2	—	7.6	2
Other	.7	—	1.4	1
C. Substantive Dimension				
Economic	16.0	—	15.9	1
Occupational	31.9	7	41.4	10
Educational	31.9	15	3.4	3
Familial-Social	4.2	2	13.8	6
General attraction	13.2	—	13.8	1
Other	2.8	—	11.7	3
Number of Cases	(145)	(24)	(145)	(24)

Problems encountered in adapting to the new environment in the urban place of destination were more or less practical ones of residential, occupational and economic nature, to begin with. This was partly reflected in or boosted by their difficulty in making social and psychological adaptation. Theoretically, in the course of adjustment caused by their earlier act of migrating to the city, they have come to sense a degree of cognitive dissonance. New definitions of the situation and some readjustments were called for under the circumstances. In defining their situation in the city, they must have come to the conclusion that the subjectively satisfying place utility of the urban destination has been relatively diminished compared to the time when they first entered it. It was time they were looking for an alternative place. In this process, they found that the rural origin which they happened to have abandoned, temporarily or permanently, still was the place to go to. The location-specific capital, subjectively and objectively, was still there. Their family land, family occupation, family itself, and friends and old neighbors were still there to return to. It must have been this sort of process of social psychological behavioral change that we could impute upon the data presented so far in order to understand the act of return migration, with particular emphasis on the role of adaptation to the destination.

At this juncture, it might be useful to take a quick look at the present conditions of those who have returned home, in comparison with urban stayers and rural natives. Our argument all along has been that adaptation to the city had much to do with the migrant's decision to return home, and that some attraction must have been found in the rural origin. If this is so, we might be able to expect that urban out-migrants should far better than returnees, while returnees in turn must be at least slightly better off than rural non-migrant natives.

According to Table 1 presented earlier in this paper, as far as male respondents are concerned, out-migrant stayers indeed far better than returnees who are better off than rural

natives, in terms of their educational attainment, occupational status, and monthly income. It was also ascertained in the analysis of male respondents as appearing in the other report (Lee, 1980) that the "Modernism" attitudes were most strongly held by urban stayers, followed by returnees, and rural nonmigrants. In the case of females, the same order holds for the level of monthly family income. But the level of education and occupation is favorable to female returnees rather than stayers. To make some sense out of this inconsistency, we need to compare age and marital status of the female respondents. And one can readily notice that female returnees are the youngest of all the groups under study and 20 out of 24 still unmarried.

Taking all these into account, we now can safely say that returnees indeed stand somewhere in-between urban stayers and rural natives insofar as their current socioeconomic status at the place of origin is concerned. Not only that, the level of monthly family income has in fact risen considerably when compared with that while in the city. Of course, some time has lapsed in-between, but this upward mobility is important in trying to interpret the findings in light of the adaptation approach we are proposing here. It was not merely the relative difficulty in adapting to the city life but some string pulling them back to the origin that entered in the decision to return home.

This, however, should not mislead the reader to imply that returnees are necessarily happy back home. They are not. In fact, their relative socio-economic status still is lower than that of urban stayers, even though it is higher than rural non-migrant natives, and even if their own lot has not necessarily been worsened by the return move itself. As reported in the detailed analysis of male respondents (Lee, 1980), many returnees are still longing to leave the rural origin and are not exactly adapting to it satisfactorily, not only to themselves but to the eyes of their old neighbors many of whom consider them as intruders in a way. And the mere fact that they have migrated more often simply reflects their propensity to move again. Thus, urban-rural return migration at the present context seems to pose rather as a problem than as a solution to the population redistribution question.

VI. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Despite some minor complications caused by inclusion of the female respondents in the data analysis, the descriptive comparison of the characteristics and behavior of migrants as presented in this paper has rendered a general support to our basic guiding assumption that return migration indeed is a distinct pattern of behavior and return migrants are distinct kinds of people. It has also been ascertained in general that certain pre-migration characteristics, migration behavior and history affect the migrant's adaptation to the new environment in the place of urban destination, and adaptation in turn makes a significant difference in deciding whether to return or stay. Although the limitation of data caused by the small number of female migrants has precluded us from any detailed, technically sophisticated analysis, the following summary would adequately represent the sequential nature of our analysis and the most important variables playing a role in each step. Of course, this summary is made from the analysis of male data only.

The slight complication has been caused mainly by a couple of socio-demographic characteristics of female migrants studied. Above all, female returnees were and still are very young and many of female out-migrant stayers left the rural origin for the specific purpose of marriage. Therefore, some of the inconsistencies found in the data were generally explained away by these peculiarities. Otherwise, the general trend detected in the analysis of male data and the empirical generalizations drawn from them seem to stand the test even after inclusion of female data.

Since major theoretical discussion has been made occasionally in the appropriate places

Table 11. Summary of Regression Analyses for Factors Affecting Adaptation and Return (Male only)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables
Size of community first moved to (-)	Type of initial neighborhood
Marital status (+)	
Level of prior information (+)	Initial home ownership
Unit of move (+)	
Level of information (+)	First occupation
Level of information (+)	
Stepwise move (+)	Monthly income in city
Size of community first moved to (-)	New friends made in city
Size of community first moved to (-)	Feeling at home in city
Level of information (+)	
Unit of move (+)	Level of satisfaction with city life
Size of community first moved to (-)	
Level of information (-)	
Unit of Move (-)	Return move
Size of community first moved to (+)	
Monthly income in city (-)	
Feeling at home in city (-)	Return move
Level of satisfaction with city life (-)	

of the text, we will concentrate on the practical implications of the findings here. In the first place, the fact that so many young and able persons leave the place of rural origin poses serious problem of labor shortage in the rural sector, on the one hand, and urban congestion, on the other. Secondly, once they moved to the city, they then should be able to make it there and if possible invest back to the rural origin rather than return home because things do not work quite as expected in the city. And finally, even so, returnees should be able to make it here back home, adapting, adjusting, and contributing to the changing rural life.

These problems of course go beyond the scope of this particular study. The first one has to do with rural exodus, the second one with urban planning and policy, and the third one with rural development, in a sense. Yet, they all seem to be related to the type of behavior we have examined in this paper. If one leaves the rural origin very young with vague ideas about what to do in the city, they are likely to go through some adaptive difficulties and return home. Furthermore, even after the return, they do not exactly know how to get along back in the rural origin because of their educational and occupational training and experience in the city. These two problems clearly have to do with the nature of rural development that is needed. On the one hand, it should be able to hold back rural exodus. And then it should be able to retain those who have returned, on the other.

If urban-rural return migration is to be a welcome phenomenon in view of the need to pursue some sort of population redistribution programs, in order to discourage excessive urban growth and excessive rural exodus, then ways should be found to make the return move

productive. This is because we have found in this study that returnees have not been able to readapt to the rural situation and make themselves available for productive community programs. These ways should be something that can link the urban centers to the rural areas in such a way that maladaptive rural out-migrants could be usefully trained to be productive after return. It might be important to help rural out-migrants adapt well to the urban life. But considering the urban growth and the negative effect of rural exodus on the rural farm areas, it should be directed to linking depressed rural areas to the prospering but hard-to-adapt urban centers. This type of policy program requires a nationally coordinated approach because it is neither a strictly urban policy nor a rural program.

At any rate, it should be noted at this point that this study has dealt primarily with the individual behavior of migration and return migration. What is needed in the future seems to be a more structurally relevant kind of study which can incorporate the structural variables in the research design and analysis, and draw more heavily upon various sources of data. This type of structural approach should be more useful for policy needs than purely individual behavioral approach that we have taken in this particular study. Granting that some very useful insights have been gained through this study, especially for academic purposes, we still feel that a more structurally dynamic approach could be useful.

REFERENCES

- Bar-Yosef, Rivke Weiss. 1968. "Desocialization and Resocialization: Adjustment Process of Immigrants," *International Migration Review*, 2, No. 6 (Summer): 27-45.
- Benyei, L. 1969. "Greek and South Slav Immigrants in Melbourne," pp. 69-85. in C.A. Price (ed.), *The Study of Immigrants in Australia*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Breton, Raymond. 1964. "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXX (Sept.): 193-205.
- Cerese, F.P. 1974. "Expectations and Reality: A Case Study of Return Migration from the United States to Southern Italy," *International Migration Review*, 8 (Summer): 245-262.
- Chi, P.S.K. and M.W. Bogan. 1974. "A Study of Migrants and Return-Migrants in Peru," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, New York (April).
- Cronin, Constance. 1970. *The Sting of Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- DaVanzo, Julie. 1977. "Migrants who Return: Preliminary Findings from a Longitudinal Study," *The Rand Paper Series*: Rand Corporation.
- Eisenstadt, S.N. 1970. "Analysis of Patterns of Immigration and Abortion of Immigrants," in Thomas Ford and Gordon Dejong (eds.), *Social Demography*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Eldridge, H.T. 1964. "The Influence of Return Migration upon Rates of Net Migration," *Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute*, 40: 321-349.
- . 1965. "Primary, Secondary and Return Migration in the United States: 1955-1960," *Demography*, 2: 444-445.
- Feindt, W. and H.L. Browning. 1972. "Return Migration: Its Significance in an Industrial Metropolis and Agricultural Town in Mexico," *International Migration Review*, 6: 158-165.
- Festinger, Leon. 1964. *Conflict, Decision and Dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 1968. "A Theory of Social Comparison Processes," pp. 123-146. in H. Hyman and E. Singer (eds.), *Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Glaser, W.A. and G.C. Habers. 1974. "The Migration and Return of Professionals," *International Migration Review*, 8: 227-244.
- Golant, Stephen M. 1971. Adjustment Process in a System: A Behavioral Model of Human Movement. *Geographical Analysis*, 3: 203-220.
- Goldlust, John and Anthony Richmond. 1974. "Multivariate Model of Immigrant Adaptation," *International Migration Review*, 8 (Summer): 193-225.
- Gordon, Milton. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hernandez-Alvarez, J. 1967. "Return Migration to Puerto Rico," *Population Monograph Series*, 1.

Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Kim, Kyong-Dong, and On-Jook Lee. 1979. "Adaptation to the City and Return Home in the Republic of Korea." *International Social Science Journal*, 31: 263-272.
- Lee, On-Jook, 1980. *Urban-to-Rural Return Migration in Korea*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- Lianos, T.P. 1975. "Flows of Greek Out-Migration and Return Migration," *International Migration Review*, 13: 119-133.
- Myers, George C., R. McGinnis, and G. Masnick. 1967. "The Duration of Residence Approach to a Dynamic Stochastic Model of Internal Migration: A Test of the Axiom of Cumulative Inertia," *Eugenics Quarterly*, 14: 121-126.
- Myers, G.C., and G. Masnick. 1968. "The Migration Experience of New York Puerto Ricans: A Perspective on Return." *International Migration Review*, 2 (Spring): 80-90.
- Nagata, J.A. 1969. "Adaptation and Integration of Greek Working Class Immigrants in the City of Toronto, Canada: A Situational Approach," *International Migration Review*, 4 (Fall): 44-70.
- Price, Charles. 1969. "The Study of Assimilation," in John A. Jackson (ed.). *Migration*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Pryor, R.J. 1974. "Population Redistribution and Development Planning in South East Asia," paper presented at the International Geographical Union New Zealand Regional Conference, Massey University, Palmerston North (December).
- . 1976. "Conceptualizing Migration Behavior. A Problem in Micro-Demographic Analysis," revised paper originally presented at World Population Year Symposium on Problems of Population and Scale, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Rex, J. and R. Moore. 1967. *Race, Community and Conflict*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Richardson, A. 1967. "A Theory and Method for the Psychological Study of Assimilation," *International Migration Review*, 2 (Fall): 3-30.
- Richmond, Anthony. 1967. *Post-War Immigrants in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- . 1968. "Return Migration from Canada to Britain," *Population Studies*, 32: 263-271.
- Rodriguez, Orlando. 1974. *Social Determinants of Non-Return: Foreign Students from Developing Countries in the United States*. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.
- Senstock, Mary C. 1969. "Differential Rates of Assimilation in an Ethnic Group: In Ritual, Social Interaction, and Normative Culture," *International Migration Review*, 3 (Spring): 18-31.
- Shaw, R.P. 1975. *Migration Theory and Fact*. Philadelphia: Regional Science Research Institute. Bibliography Series, 5.
- Simmons, A.B. and G.R. Cardona. 1972. "Rural-Urban Migration: Who Comes, Who Stays, Who Returns? The Case of Bogota, Columbia, 1928-68," *International Migration Review*, 6: 166-181.
- Toren, N. 1975. "The Effect of Economic Incentives on Return Migration," *International Migration*, 13: 134-146.
- . 1976. "Return to Zion: Characteristics and Motivations of Returning Emigrants," *Social Forces*, 54: 546-558.
- UN-ESCAP. 1975. "Population of the Republic of Korea," *Country Monograph Series No. 2*, Bangkok: UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.

이주와 도시에의 적응 :

한국에서의 귀환자와 체류자의 비교 연구

李 溫 竹
金 璟 東

이 논문은 도시에서 농촌으로 귀환하는 사람들의 이주행위와 그 특징을 농촌에서 이주하여 계속 도시에 거주하는 자(체류자)들과 비교하여 고찰하고 있으며 또한 도시에서 농촌으로의 귀환자들이 선택적이며 특정한 행위유형을 나타낼뿐 아니라 도시적응 양식에 있어서도 특유하다는 일반적 가정을 검토하고 있다. 분석에 이용한 자료는 1977년 여름, 농촌 읍과 면 1개씩, 2개의 지방도시 및 서울에서 행해진 소규모 조사에서 수립되었다. 분석의 초점은 귀환이동자와 체류자들이 겪는 도시에의 적응도와 적응의 유형에 맞추고 있다. 주거, 직업, 경제, 사회, 심리적 측면에서의 적응수준이 도시체류자 보다 귀환 이동자들이 일반적으로 더 낮다는 결과가 나타났다. 분석에 여성이주자들을 포함시킴으로써 분석 결과에 어느 정도의 혼란을 가져오기는 했지만 의미 있는 정도는 아니다. 2개의 이동자 집단간에 있어 이주 경력의 지역적—생태학적인 측면은 물론 몇가지 선택된 이주하기 전의 특징과 이주 결정 및 이주행위 유형을 비교해 보았다. 그러한 면에서 두 집단간에 어떤 중요한 차이점을 드러내고 있다는 것이 명백해졌다. 도시에서 농촌으로의 귀환이동의 결과에 대한 몇가지 측면을 탐구해 본 결과, 몇가지 SES 변수들에 있어서 귀환자들은 도시체류자들과 농촌원주민들 중간에 위치한다는 결론을 얻었다.

이런 결과가 지니는 이론적 정책적 함의는 농촌 발전과 인구재분산에 연관하여 논의되고 있다.