Interlinkages between Migration and Inequality in Africa: Review of Contemporary Studies

Mary Muyonga*, George Odipo** and Alfred O. Agwanda***

** Population Studies and Research Institute, University of Nairobi, Kenya*
Corresponding author. Email: mmuyonga@students.uonbi.ac.ke
*** Population Studies and Research Institute, University of Nairobi, Kenya*
**** Population Studies and Research Institute, University of Nairobi, Kenya*

In recent times, migration and inequality have become topical issues of global attention. In the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Goal 10 focuses on tackling inequality with indicator 10.7, which pertains to the facilitation of safe, orderly, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people. Few studies show that migration and inequality are interlinked; yet, others show that migration is an outcome of inequality. To the contrary, others argue that migration triggers inequality in the sending areas, due to increased flows of remittances sent by migrants to their areas of origin. The differential conclusions are attributed to varied methodological approaches used and the dimension of inequality investigated.

This paper seeks to contribute to this knowledge gap by highlighting the scholarly work on migration and inequality in Africa, challenges encountered, as well as presenting the key findings. The study comprised a desk review of published studies on migration and inequality in Africa.

The review found that most studies in Africa relied on census and survey data and mostly focused on the nexus between economic inequality and migration, thus ignoring other social inequalities. Few studies used population registers. None of the studies considered the drivers of internal and international migration and how these impact on inequality.

The study recommends an investigation of the nexus between non-income inequalities and migration as well as the unpacking of the contextual factors behind inequality and migration using both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Additionally, the study strongly encourages the use of specialist migration surveys to improve the body of knowledge on this subject.

Keywords: migration, inequality, migration survey, Kenya, Africa

INTRODUCTION

Migration and inequality are twin issues that have occupied global governance and humanitarian discourse in the recent years with the western countries focusing on the governance of migration, and large programs put in place to improve coordination and policy response (see for example the Global Knowledge Partnership on Migration and Development[1] (KNOMAD). The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) reflect the shifting global concerns on unsustainable development and rising inequality, with Goal 10 dealing with the reduction of inequality within and between countries. Tracking progress on SDG Goal 10 requires an assessment of the interface between migration and inequalities in the world.

Conceptually, there is no standard definition of inequality although different scholars agree that it has to do with differences in access to opportunities and outcomes in each population. McKay (2002:1) describes inequality as 'concerning variations in living standards across a whole population'. Inequality is a multidimensional concept but there is vast literature on economic inequality compared to any other dimensions of inequality. Economists define economic inequality as 'the fundamental disparity that permits one individual certain material choices, while denying another individual those very same choices' (Ray, 1998:170). Spatial inequality, defined as inequality in economic and social indicators of wellbeing across geographical units within a country, is also more common in the literature (Kanbur and Venables, 2005).

Globally, studies on migration and inequality rely on longitudinal data that compare prevailing circumstances before and after migration, looking critically at how household livelihood patterns change after migration. The studies vary methodologically, with some conceptualizing remittances as an exogenous source of income, and thus, measure how inequality in sending areas arises between households which have migrants and those that do not have migrants. Others simulate a counterfactual argument, where a society is compared with the contribution of income from remittances and compared with a different scenario where remittances do not exist. Fewer studies feature the effect of other dimensions of inequality on migration including spatial and horizontal inequalities.

Studies on the impact of migration on inequality have yielded stronger results from international migration than internal migration. Most of the global scholarly discourse feature the US-Mexico migration, China, and Global North to South pathways, but fewer studies have been done in Africa which boasts large intra-continental migratory flows. This paper reviews the existing literature of studies on the linkages between migration and inequality in Africa, interrogating the design, methodologies employed, as well as key findings on the linkages between migration and inequality in Africa.

The paper is organized as follows: The next two sections provide the rationale and methodology. Section 4 highlights the theoretical perspectives of migration and inequality. Section 5 features the sources of data and methodological issues in study-

[1] See www.knomad.org

ing migration and inequality. Section 6 focuses on the empirical studies in Africa and their key findings on the relationship between migration and inequality. Section 7 provides a synthesis of the emerging issues from the earlier sections, while the last section provides conclusions and recommendations on studying migration and inequality in Africa.

RATIONALE

The choice of reviewing African-based studies separately from the Western and other regions is aimed at highlighting the uniqueness of the inequality structure, discourse, policy response and methodological issues that may face researchers based in Africa due to its geopolitical state. As the world moves towards monitoring trends on the SDG goals, there is a need to show evidence of the impact of migration on inequality in the Global South, using case studies from the continent to inform the policy discourse and programmatic interventions as necessary.

METHODOLOGY

The review uses secondary data sources based on published articles investigating migration and inequality in Africa. The review was not a systematic review but an online search for scholarly articles on migration and inequality in Africa. The methodology adopted included the use of the keywords, 'inequality', 'migration', and 'Africa' as well as the use of the phrase 'migration and inequality in Africa'. No time frames were indicated, to enable a higher number of articles to be traced.

Google Scholar was used as it is a freely accessible web search engine that indexes the full text or metadata of scholarly literature across an array of publishing formats and disciplines. The interface of Google makes it easier to do academic research than is possible through the standard Google interface. Once the articles were identified by Google Scholar, they were categorized by country and year of publication. All identified articles were considered in the review while those articles that did not consider migration and inequality were left out of the review.

Several limitations arise from using online searches including the fact that not all articles are published through such platforms, prompting some researchers to conclude that there is inequality of global academic knowledge production (Wight, 2008; Mouton, 2010; Collyer, 2018; Medie and Kang, 2018). Google Scholar uses automatic indexing systems resulting in the accidental indexing of non-scholarly sources. The search engine also limits each search to a maximum of 1,000 results, which are too voluminous to explore, and hence require additional effective ways of locating the relevant articles.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON MIGRATION AND INEQUALITY NEXUS

Migration and inequality are both multidimensional concepts that have been studied over the years and theoretical formulations have been made to better understand these phenomena. Migration is founded on various theoretical dispensations that describe the patterns, motivations, choices and outcomes of human mobility. Inequality on the other hand is a concept that has been associated with human welfare as economic development occurs, therefore focusing on how resources are shared and distributed within and between societies. Few studies have theorized the direct link between migration and inequality.

Demographic theories have an impact on the understanding of the migration and inequality nexus, and these include the seminal work by the American demographer, Frank Notestein who postulated the *Demographic Transition Theory* (Notestein, 1945). However, his work does not address outmigration in this formulation. The theory, based on data from the western world, describes the relationship between economic development and demographic changes, with a focus on the changing dynamics of mortality and fertility as society grows. A criticism of the theory is that it is based on experiences of the western world, which are different from those in developing countries, including Africa (Mabogunje, 1970). Additionally, it ignores the impact of migration transitions as societies develop over time. The theory does not facilitate the understanding of migration and inequality but provides a basis for understanding how population dynamics change over time. Zelinsky (1971) offers an alternative theory, the *Migration Transition Model* that links migration to Notestein's demographic transition theory. While still using data from western countries, Zelinsky shows that migration typologies depend on a country's stage of development, concluding that the more developed a country, the more complex the migration systems. Zelinsky has been criticized for ignoring the effects of spatio-temporal changes that occur in societies and which may impact migratory behavior, especially the improvements in transport and communications infrastructure (Skeldon, 1990; De Haas, 2007).

While the demographic transition theory does not help in explaining the migration and inequality nexus, the modified Zelinksy (1971) migration transition model is useful as it shows how complex migration typologies are formed as a society develops. The theory expounds on the migration hump showing high migration at the low levels of development, and after a critical threshold, migration begins to decline (Stark and Taylor, 1991; Faini and Venturini, 1993; Vogler and Rotte, 2000). The inverse relationship between migration and development has been observed in studies looking at migration and income inequality, noting that during the early stages of migration, inequality is low, but as migration rises, inequality also rises leading to a threshold where no further rise in inequality occurs with increased migration (Kuznets, 1955).

Several theories elaborate on the drivers of migration and mechanisms through which migration is sustained. Migrant selectivity is expounded on in the *Human Capital Theory* (Lee, 1966) which posits that international migration depends on the individual attributes of migrants including age, sex, educational level and skills, competencies, marital status, previous experience as well as risk-taking spirit. This theory has been particularly useful in the migration and inequality nexus, as it shows the selectivity of migration; hence, the inequality of opportunities between nations leads to an increase in international migration. A similar observation is made in the *Push and Pull Model,* as articulated by Ravenstein (1885), that people move from their origin areas due to 'push factors' that drive them away and move to their destination areas due to 'pull factors' that attract them. Ultimately, the main flows are fueled by wage differentials between nations, which perpetuate migration.

The *Migration Systems Theory* pioneered by Mabogunje (1970) identifies a migration system as comprising of places linked by flows and counterflows of people, goods, and information, which increases the likelihood of migration between such systems. This theory is based on the observations of rural to urban migration in Africa and posits that the macro environment influences the individual migrants' decisions. Factors that influence migration decision-making, are the social welfare system including education and health, economic conditions including wages, prices, consumer preferences and degree of industrial development, as well as technological development including transport and communication networks. This theory argues that the transition of migrants from rural to urban subsystems results in a complete transformation of their social and other attributes. The theory recognizes the importance of a feedback mechanism between sending and receiving areas that promotes the continuous flow of people, goods and information between them.

The self-sustaining nature of migration is expounded by the *Cumulative Causation Theory* postulated by Myrdal (1957) and later modified by Massey (Massey, 1990; Massey et al, 1994; Massey and Zenteno, 1999), with the proponents arguing that migration motivations are different and each migration experience alters the social contexts in which each occurred.

The *Neoclassical Theory* of migration (Harris and Todaro, 1970) argues that migrants move from regions with low wages to those of higher wages by considering the cost-benefit of migrating. The theory argues that when wage differentials between regions in a country are reduced, then migration levels also reduce, thus migration is seen as an equalizing factor for rural-urban migration. Critics have pointed out that migration seems to continue even when there are no economic benefits or job opportunities available in the urban areas. Thus, they argue that it is not only economic considerations that make individuals move. The theory is useful in understanding the structural factors influencing migration, including spatial inequalities and wage inequalities.

The *Dual Market Economy Theory* (Piore, 1979), corroborates this view, adding that the capitalism of international migration maintained by two coexisting economic models, the capital-intensive primary sectors which offer well-paying jobs and high wages, and the labor-intensive sectors which have low wages and unskilled labor. Migrants therefore move to the regions with higher skills and higher wages, prompting the migration of educated and skilled members of the society compared to the immobility of their uneducated counterparts.

The *New Economics of Migration Theory* (Taylor, 1999) shifts the focus from individual migrant decisions to migrant households or families, where migration is seen as a household survival strategy. Migrants, both local and international, are seen to move based on the strategic decisions their households make when faced with economic shocks such as poor harvests, and harsh weather conditions. The theory helps in explaining the household decision-making mechanism, which results in either a positive or a negative impact of migration on inequality.

While these models argue that wage differentials between nations fuel migration, this view has been criticized as it ignores the counter flows between nations with shared history, who have a mutually dependent series of flows and counter-flows, as expounded in the *World Systems Theory* (Fawcett and Arnold,1987). This theory conceptualizes the world as a capitalist system that perpetuates international migration, noting that colonialism shifted the global relations between the colonizers and the colonized countries, resulting in the continued flows of populations between the two regions owing to the differences in economic development between them. Capitalist firms from rich countries move to poorer peripheral countries in search of land, raw materials and markets for their products. Thus, proponents of this theory argue that migration systems are context specific and are linked by people who share historical, cultural, colonial and technological linkages. This perspective enriches the conceptualization of migration and inequality nexus, as it considers the role of macro factors, including the historical and sociocultural background of the migration system.

The review of the different theories shows that few of them distinctively look at migration and inequality, although they interrogate the possible consequences of migration and development. Most of the theories describe the development and mobility patterns of the western nations, but there is a need to have theories that are grounded in the social contexts and structural realities of different countries (Brown and Sanders, 1981). While the *World Systems Theory* expounds how colonial history influences inequalities between nations and perpetuates migration flows across the regions, the *Push and Pull Theory* and the *Human Capital Theory* elaborate on how the flows are sustained. The structured relations between origin and destination areas have also been well articulated in the works of Zelinsky (1971) and Skeldon (1990) who note the linkage between the demographic processes and the resultant typologies of migration. The theories under review only focus on international migration and not internal migration, although one could expect that they could also apply to the domestic migration contexts. Brown and Sanders (1981) criticize them as inadequate in explaining scenarios in developing countries, including the role of 'pull factors' including the importance of the informal sector to rural-urban migrants, the role of social networks in origin and destination areas, the impacts of circular and seasonal migration strategies as well as structural issues, including class and status of migrants.

The review of the literature shows that migration, unlike the other population dynamics of fertility and mortality, is a system that affects and is affected by development (Skeldon, 1997; De Haas, 2010). Migration is an endogenous factor in development, or part of that change but the development impacts on migration are heterogeneous. De Haas (2007) reformulated the mobility transition in a more integrated format which can simply be referred to as *Migration Transition.* In this reformulation and underscoring the work of Skeldon (1997), it is impossible to envisage development without migration, as migration is part of development. Through this framework, De Haas (2007) provides three perspectives about the migration-development nexus. First, development is generally associated with higher overall levels of migration and mobility which arises because of increasing capabilities by loosening constraints on movement, increasing aspirations and increasing occupational specialization. Secondly, the relation between migration and broader development processes is fundamentally non-linear as development goes with the shifting patterns of the spatial opportunity differential. Thirdly, societies tend to go through a sequence of internal and international migration transitions.

De Haas (2010) reiterated that other factors, particularly those rooted in the political economy of countries, geographical location and historical contingencies explain why countries with roughly similar levels of development show divergent migration patterns. He summarizes the two emerging dilemmas about migration and inequality. On the one hand, migration is linked to increased inequality because migrants tend to come from better off households. On the other hand, as more migration occurs, the sending areas lose out on the human capital as development gains, leading to increased spatial inequalities between the sending and receiving areas. Empirical evidence has shown that migration does have positive effects on sending areas, and that it does not always lead to increased inequalities. Owing to the contradiction inherent in some of the findings, he proposes the need to conceptualize the role of structural factors including the political, institutional, economic, social and cultural contexts within which migration occurs, as well as the role of agency, the real capacity of humans to overcome constraints and potentially reshape structure (De Haas, 2010:241). Similar views have been articulated by other scholars such as Massey et al (1999) and Morawska (2007) who criticize theories that ignore human agency and how this interacts with state and other social structures to influence migration and inequality.

Inequalities both reflect and amplify a constrained opportunity structure (Melamed and Samman, 2013). Black et al (2006) argue that across different geographical, economic and social environments, the relationship between institutions of migration and inequality is governed by access – who gets to migrate where – and the different opportunities that different types of migration streams offer.

The complexity of the theorizing of migration has been captured in the works of De Haas (2014) where he notes that, 'there is no central body of conceptual frameworks or theories on migration that can guide and be informed by empirical work' (De Haas, 2014:6). He outlines some of the challenges faced in applying the theory by the different 'modes of inquiry' adopted by scholars, such as focus on international versus internal migration as an example. The resultant complexity of migration confirms that the phenomenon 'has many parts in elaborate, multi-layered arrangements' (ibid).

In the next section, the paper reviews the findings on the established linkages between migration and inequality.

INTERLINKAGES OF MIGRATION AND INEQUALITY

Migration and inequality are interlinked through the development process, with studies showing that economic development results in unequal spatial development and therefore unequal wages and incomes between urban and rural areas, resulting in an inverse relationship between migration and development. With increased development, the rising incomes in the urban areas lead to urban-rural disparities in wages and result in the increase in migration between urban and rural areas. Simon Kuznets postulated this in his seminal paper on economic development and inequality, noting that during the early stages of economic development, inequality increases with rising incomes, but as the level of per capita income increases, inequality reduces, leading to an inverted U-shape relationship between income inequality and economic development (Kuznets, 1955). This assertion has been criticized for focusing on the developed countries rather than being aligned to the realities of the developing world.

An alternative mechanism is proposed by Lipton (1980), noting that inequalities within the origin area pushes out migration, hence individuals living in unequal settings tend to move out. As a result of the outmigration, remittances sent from migrants from rich households have a negative effect on the rural income distribution as it increases income inequality between migrant and non-migrant households. In the longer term, as migration increases between rural and urban areas, this leads to a neutralizing effect on intrahousehold inequality in sending areas. This perspective shows the linkage between inequalities in sending areas and the increased migration intensities, as migrants move to regions with better prospects.

The effects of migration on inequality can be direct or indirect. The direct effects of migration on inequality are associated with remittances sent to migrant households thereby changing their patterns of household expenditure and investments. The indirect effect is through the 'multiplier effects' of such investments and changes in the labor market in sending communities (Mendola, 2012). Barham and Boucher (1998) found that migration increases income inequality when comparing households with migrants to those without migrants, in their Nicaraguan study. Similar findings were observed in Pakistan (Oberai and Singh, 1980) and in Kenya (Knowles and Anker, 1981). Other studies did not find the same results when they decomposed incomes based on their sources. Those studies, conducted in Mexico, thus concluded that the effect of remittances on income inequality depends on the length of the migration history of the community, the ranking of the migrant households within the origin communities as well as the role that remittances play in comparison to other income sources for the receiving households (Stark et al, 1986).

While some studies focus on the mechanism through which migration effects inequality, scholars such as Stark and Taylor (1991) caution that the net effect of remittances on inequality depends on the relative deprivation of rural households before migration occurs. They conclude that societies with a longer migration history report a neutralizing effect on the income inequalities in the longer term. Ebeke and Le Goff (2011) add that the impact that migration is likely to have on inequality will depend on the cost of migration, level of development and human capital in origin communities. The effect of remittances has been found to spill over to the wider community (Massey et al, 1994). Communities also benefit from migrant networks which help to reduce the costs associated with migration, as they share information and resources that make migration less risky. They note that the effect of remittances on inequality is dependent on the position of the migrant household within the income distribution of the sending community.

The interlinkages of migration and inequality differ based on the type of migration, as differential effects have been found when comparing international and internal migration. Black et al (2006) conclude that although the migration-inequality relationship varies across space and time, there is a need to specify the type of migration and dimension of inequality as different types of migration may have different effects on different types of inequality.

Other linkages identified by scholars focus on the pessimistic or positivist views on the effects of migration on equality and vice versa. For the pessimists, migration results in increasing inequalities between regions reinforcing spatial and interpersonal disparities in development in low income sending communities, as seen in empirical studies in India (Zachariah et al, 2001); in Mexico (Binford, 2003; McKenzie and Rapoport, 2006); in Bangladesh (Rahman, 2000); and a comparative study of global data (Solimano, 2001). Additionally, there are scholars who believe that outmigration leads to the so-called 'brain drain' in rural areas, as the more educated members are more likely to migrate. A counter narrative argues that migration has the positive effect of reducing inequalities between regions, by leading to 'brain gain', as migrants acquire new skills which make them more competitive, and the remittances they send back are used to improve livelihoods.

Adams et al (2008) outline the two key methodological issues that arise when studying the impact of remittances on income inequality. The first approach considers remittances as an exogenous transfer from migrants, while the second approach considers remittances as an extra source of income that the migrant would earn if they had not moved out. Each of these cases requires a different determination. For the first case of remittances as exogenous income, the key task is to determine how such remittances affect the overall distribution of income in the origin area (Gustafsson and Makonnen, 1993). For the second case, the task will be to compute the changes in inequality in a counterfactual scenario where there is no migration and no remittance and compare that with scenarios where there is migration and remittance with an input of the expected income that migrants would have earned if they had stayed at home (Adams and Page, 2005; Adams et al, 2008). Indeed, Barham and Boucher (1998) concur that these differential findings arise due to the empirical contexts of the study areas as well as methodological rigor, with studies that consider remittances as an exogenous transfer of income or as a substitute to home earnings getting conflicting findings on the inequality and migration nexus.

De Haas (2010:241) proposes the need to conceptualize the role of structural factors, including the political, institutional, economic, social and cultural contexts within which migration occurs, as well as the role of agency, the capacity of humans to overcome constraints and potentially reshape structure. Similar views have been articulated by other scholars such as Massey et al (1999) and Morawska (2007) who criticize theories that ignore human agency and how this interacts with state and other social structures to influence migration and inequality.

REVIEW OF STUDIES IN AFRICA

This section reviews the contemporary studies in Africa and highlights the conceptualization of the subject, data sources, and mechanisms through which migration and inequality are interrelated.

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF MIGRATION AND INEQUALITY IN AFRICA

The conceptualization of a migrant has differed in various studies conducted in Africa with those based on census data defining a migrant as a person who has changed the 'usual place of residence' at least once during the migration interval, which is one year before the census. For the normal census a migrant is considered a person who lived in the household for at least one year. In others, such as the World Bank African Migration project, a migrant is defined as a person who used to the live in a household in the country, for at least six months, to live abroad (international migrant) or in another village or urban area within the country (internal migrant). This definition of a migrant could influence the outcome of analysis, with those making moves within a shorter period likely to inflate the number of migrants.

While migration is easy to measure, inequality presents a different conceptual challenge. Inequality is defined as the difference in social status, wealth or opportunity between people or groups.2 Distinction is often made between inequality of outcomes and inequality of opportunity. Inequality of outcomes is concerned with differences in overall living economic conditions including income, wealth, education and nutrition. Inequality of opportunity is concerned with differential access to opportunities by people living in the same community, and therefore the circumstances surrounding their place of birth, their parental background, ethnicity and gender determine their access to opportunities, including where they go to school,

[2] https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/inequality

what jobs they get and how economically successful they become. The studies reviewed have not delved into the interlinkages within and between group inequalities and migration, and this is an area for future exploration.

Globally, studies looking at migration and inequality have used the Gini coefficient generated from the Lorenz curve (Morgan, 1962). This requires the availability of consumption data from households which is not captured in the census questionnaires. Thus, most African countries have used the Small Area Estimation technique to generate values for subnational estimates (Ngugi, Kipruto and Samoei, 2013). An improvement in measuring inequality when income and expenditure data is unavailable in surveys or census was proposed by McKenzie (2005), where the relative measure of 'inequality in living standards' (I), is derived using asset indicators. The method has been used widely in studies of migration and inequality, including Latin American Migration Surveys3 where questions are asked about household assets.

McKay (2002) proposes that inequality studies should explore other dimensions apart form income, including the inequality of opportunities and outcomes, within-group and between-group inequalities such as considering households within communities, as well as exploring the temporal variations of inequality. Few studies have considered all these suggestions but there has been a greater focus on income inequality by economists in most studies including those in Africa, as will be outlined in the next section.

DATA SOURCES AND STUDY DESIGN IN AFRICA

Like most global studies, the scholarly work in Africa has relied on the three main data sources namely, censuses, surveys including specialist surveys, and ethnographic studies. While studies in the developed nations use population registers as a major source of data for migration studies, in Africa, due to poor civil registration systems, this is limited.

Survey data has been widely used to analyze the interlinkages between migration and inequality. The World Bank Living Standards Survey4 provides useful data on a wide range of issues including migration and migrant welfare. The surveys have been conducted in Nigeria, Ghana, Tanzania, Burkina Faso, Kenya, Senegal, South Africa and Uganda. A disadvantage of survey data is that it is not standardized and comparable as noted in a review of 70 household surveys conducted between 1990 and 2006 (Plaza et al, 2011). For example, the review found that migration modules are different and incomparable across many African countries, with most surveys collecting information on migration history of all household members above 15 years of age, while others collected information only from the head of the household.

[3] This includes the Mexican Migration Project (MMP) and subsequent Latin American Migration Project (McKenzie, 2005:2).

[4] The Living Standards Measurement Study (LSMS) is a household survey program housed within the Survey Unit of the World Bank's Development Data Group that provides technical assistance to national statistical offices (NSOs) in the design and implementation of multi-topic household surveys.

Additionally, sections capturing migration data in these surveys are located differently, with some surveys putting this in a stand-alone, or incorporating it into the other modules (ibid).

Challenges identified in obtaining survey information include the difficulty in sampling of households. Researchers therefore rely on the use of national sampling frames to identify such households or the use of remittance transfer data from mobile phones (Bang et al, 2016). A critical look at the gender dynamics of studies based on sample surveys, shows that some studies featured only male migrants, especially those dealing with international migration. For example, in the study of migration and inequality in Egypt which sampled only male migrants, Adams (1989:47) notes that in rural Egypt, social tradition denied women in rural areas to work 'outside the home' by describing this as 'shameful'. There would thus have been fewer women in the study owing to such socio-cultural factors.

Census data has also been a source of data for research on migration and inequality. The census data captures two types of data, namely the migration event where information is collected about the migrants, capturing all the moves they make across time and space; and the migration transition where information is collected about who moved, when and where to – the kind of information collected in the national census. An obvious weakness of migration transition measure is that it fails to capture repeat moves, returns or even deaths during the interphase. Migration data captured in the census relates to the place of current residence, how long an individual has lived in such residence, any previous migration, place of birth and place of current remuneration, while reasons and motivations for migration are largely uncaptured. Migration history can be easily captured through a trend analysis of a series of census datasets (see Arouri and Nguyen, 2018) while inequality data can be derived from comparing household living conditions.

Increasingly popular are the specialist migration surveys that provide unique and rich data on the migration experience and migrant attributes which can be used to analyze migration trends, including effect of remittances on household economies (Stark and Lucas, 1988). In the early 90s, only Botswana and Burkina Faso had conducted such surveys, as observed by Oucho and Gould (1993). Presently, more countries in Africa have conducted specialist migration surveys, including Egypt which carried out the Egypt Household International Migration Survey (Egypt-HIMS) in 2013, that provides detailed information on why, when, where and how migration has occurred. The Ethiopian Rural Household Survey (ERHS) also provides longitudinal data. The Remittances Surveys conducted by the World Bank also add to the pool of these resources, although they covered a few countries in Africa.

Comparatively, the use of specialist surveys has provided a wealth of knowledge about the US-Mexico border migration streams where data from the Mexico National Rural Household Survey (*Encuesta Nacional a Hogares Rurales de Mexico*, or ENHRUM) provides detailed data on assets, sociodemographic characteristics, production, income sources and migration from a nationally representative sample of rural households. The other major source of data has been the Mexican Migration Project which employs ethnographic survey methodology to provide both qualitative and quantitative data; the Latin American Migration Project (LAMP) and later the Migrations between Africa and Europe (MAFE) project which collected data at individual, family and national level to provide longitudinal data for analysis. In Asia, China has institutionalized the use of household registration systems (*Hakou*) to capture and monitor migration.

The studies in Africa have progressively used data from specialist surveys to track the interlinkage between migration and inequality over time. While the surveys cannot be representative of the entire population, they complement the data on the drivers and impacts of migration. Use of population registers could provide updated data on migration and household characteristics.

MAJOR FINDINGS ON LINKAGES BETWEEN MIGRATION AND INEQUALITY IN STUDIES IN AFRICA

Migration and Income Inequality Linkages

The studies reviewed were largely testing the association between migration and income inequality, thus testing Lipton's hypothesis of an inverted U-shaped relationship between the two phenomena. While some studies confirm that remittances lead to higher inequality in origin areas by increasing inequality between migrant and non-migrant households, others show that remittances reduce such inequality. In Kenya, Knowles and Anker (1981) found a weak effect when they studied the link between urban-rural remittances and income inequality, noting that remittances are highly related to the level of education and income, urban residence and migrant status as well as ownership of a house in the home areas and number of dependants living in a different residence from the migrant. Other studies confirm higher income inequality in rural migrant households than non-migrant households (Hoddinott, 1992, 1994; Oyvat and wa Githinji, 2017). Bang et al (2016) used data from the Kenya Migration Household Survey (2009)5 and found that existing differentials in propensity to migrate influence the distributional effects of remittances, thus while remittances increase household expenditure across all households in Kenya, they have a huger impact on poorer households.

Several other studies confirm that households receiving remittances from internal migrants have higher expenditure and improved social status, thus concluding that migration increases inequalities in sending areas. This has been confirmed in Nigeria (Chiwuzulum et al, 2010; Fonta et al, 2011); in Botswana (Lucas and Stark, 1985); in Somaliland (Lindley, 2007); in Egypt (Adams, 1989); and in Ghana (Quartey, 2006).

International remittances have higher impact on inequality than rural remit-

[5] The dataset is publicly available for download at the World Bank's Microdata Library website at: http://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/94.

tances as shown in findings from several countries. Wouterse (2010) found that, although remittances from within Africa reduced inequality for communities in Burkina Faso, intercontinental remittances increased inequality. In Nigeria, Olowa et al (2013) found that remittances, both domestic (within Nigeria) and foreign (other countries outside Nigeria and Africa), reduced poverty and inequality in rural households. In Egypt, McCormick and Wahba (2003) attribute rising rural-urban inequalities to returnee international migrants who are more likely to settle and invest in urban areas than rural areas of Egypt, while Arouri and Nguyen (2018) found that migrants in rural Egypt were more likely to move to areas of high-asset and high-income inequality. Comparatively, in Ghana, Adams et al (2008) confirmed that international remittances increased income inequalities more than domestic remittances, although rural households were more likely to access domestic remittances than international remittances.

In some cases, studies within one country yielded conflicting results on the interlinkage between migration and inequality. In Ethiopia, De Brauw et al (2013) measured the impact of migration on household welfare by comparing migrant and non-migrant households and the findings showed that consumption per capita increased for migrants, implying there was improved wellbeing, using data from the Ethiopian Rural Household Survey,6 which was matched by a panel survey,7 tracking the employed migrants. Beyene (2014) used data from a 2004 survey8 and found no significant impact on inequality from remittances for Ethiopia when comparing actual and counterfactual scenarios with remittances. In contrast, Andersson (2014) found a considerable positive impact of remittances to rural household welfare when he considered the impact of remittances on household welfare in Ethiopia, using the data pertaining to household subjective economic wellbeing.

Elsewhere, Anyanwu (2011) assessed the impact of migrant remittances on income inequality in African countries using data for the period 1960-2006 and established that remittances had a significant positive impact on income inequality in African countries, although remittances to the North African regions fueled higher income inequality while the reverse was true for sub-Saharan Africa.

From these studies, the findings validated Lipton's hypothesis of an inverse relationship between migration and income inequality. Depending on the methodology used, some studies found a strong negative correlation between migration and income inequality while others found a weak relationship. This is similar to other global studies, such as in China (Ha et al, 2016); in Mexico, where migration remittances were found to increase inequalities, with migrants being better off than their non-migrant peers even within the same social class background (Stark et al, 1986;

[6] The ERHS is a unique, longitudinal household dataset collected by Addis Ababa University, the University of Oxford, and the International Food Policy Research Institute. It follows households from fifteen villages from 1994 to 2009. Three additional villages were added to the 2004 round (and were surveyed in 2005). The 2009 round then included all eighteen villages.

[7] The focus of the migrant tracking study was to learn about migration and remittance behavior in Ethiopia.

[8] Ethiopian Urban Socio-economic Survey (EUSS), collected by Addis Ababa University in collaboration with Gothenburg University.

Mines and Massey, 1985; Durand and Massey, 1992). In Egypt and Pakistan, remittances were found to affect the rural income distribution in poor villages (Adams 1989; Adams and Mahmood, 1992), with remittances benefitting mainly the migrant households.

Non-Income Inequalities and Migration Linkages

A few studies have reviewed the impact of spatial inequalities on migration and found that migration increased when spatial inequalities were high. In Egypt, Arouri and Nguyen (2018) found that migrants moved to regions with high income and asset inequality while McCormick and Wahba (2003) attributed rising rural-urban inequalities to returnee international migrants who were more likely to settle and invest in the urban areas than in the rural areas of Egypt. In Ogun State of Nigeria, a study found that the unequal distribution of higher educational facilities biased to urban areas resulted in increased migration between urban and rural Nigeria, leading to loss of human capital in rural regions Okhankhuele and Opafunso, 2013).

DISCUSSION

This paper presented a summary of key studies on migration and inequality in Africa, citing various empirical studies done in the region. The review shows that a higher number of studies considered the impact of income inequalities on migration compared to interlinkages between non-income inequalities and migration. The majority of the studies featured an econometric analysis of the effect of remittances on inequality, without illuminating the contextual factors behind the household welfare changes.

A limited number of studies used census data, as surveys were the more popular option. The limitation of census data, such as the unavailability of household welfare indicators to complement the migrant data collected in such censuses and surveys, results in the use of specialist surveys to fill the gap. This observation reinforces the notion that migration studies are not accompanied by data that induces perspectives of measuring inequality. The adoption of multiple data sources would therefore be highly recommended for such studies. Fewer studies looked at non-income inequalities and their interlinkages with migration.

Several studies have investigated the impact of remittances on inequalities using the World Bank sponsored Migration and Remittances Survey, although this survey did not cover many countries in Africa. This database, which is now outdated, needs to be expanded to include other countries, especially in northern and southern Africa. Local surveys such as the Ethiopian Urban Socio-economic Survey (EUSS) need to be scaled and replicated to improve the data sources on migration and inequality.

Most of the studies focused on understanding the impact of international remittances on inequalities in developing countries, but fewer considered internal migration and the effect of domestic remittances on inequality. The findings show that international migration has a positive effect on inequality compared to internal migration, attributing to the higher income received through international remittances compared to domestic remittances. However, domestic remittances have a higher impact on poorer households whose welfare changed due to remittances, according to most of the findings from the studies reviewed. What does not emerge from the studies conducted so far, is how the drivers of internal and international migration impact on inequality.

The major gap identified in most of the studies is the lack of examination of the role of human agency in understanding the effects of migration on inequality, a criticism offered by Massey et al (1999), Morawska (2007) and De Haas (2010). There is a need to expand the conceptualization of studies on migration and inequality to consider the impact of different migration patterns and their drivers. While Aiyar and Ebeke (2019) considered this for some developing countries, the focus was only on international migration and not internal migration.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Most studies relied on quantitative data sources from surveys. However, these are limited as they do not capture the qualitative aspects of migration. Although the Mexican studies used the ethnographic survey methodology in their migration surveys, they have limited coverage of countries in Africa. The use of specialist surveys in Africa to complement data on migration is a research necessity and more countries need to embrace it.

This literature review offers recommendations to address the shortcomings identified above. First, there is a need to update and increase the database of migration and remittances studies to incorporate more countries for comparative analysis, and to increase such analysis to non-income inequalities, including intergenerational, gender and spatial analysis. Further, there is a need to unpack the contextual factors behind inequality and migration by adopting qualitative techniques to understand how inequality affects those who migrate and those who do not migrate. The role of human agency should also be considered in future studies.

The policy implications of these findings include the need to improve the collection of longitudinal data on migration to inform the cross-sectional analysis of the impacts of migration. While the SDGs target the reduction of inequalities between and within countries, most of the African countries need to improve in their measurement and monitoring of internal and interregional migration, which are the most popular typologies in Africa. Additionally, there should be a deliberate effort to conduct specialist migration surveys periodically across most of the African countries to allow for comparative analysis.

REFERENCES

Adams Jr, R. H. 1989. Worker remittances and inequality in rural Egypt. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 38(1): 45-71.

Adams Jr, R. H., and Mahmood, Z. 1992. The effects of migration and remittances on inequality in rural Pakistan [with comments]. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 31(4): 1189-1206.

Adams Jr, R. H., and Page, J. 2005. Do international migration and remittances reduce poverty in developing countries? *World Development*, 33(10): 1645-1669.

Adams, R. H., Cuecuecha, A., and Page, J. 2008. *The impact of remittances on poverty and inequality in Ghana*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Aiyar, S. S., and Ebeke, C. 2019. Inequality of opportunity, inequality of income and economic growth. IMF Working Paper.

Andersson, L. 2014. Migration, remittances and household welfare in Ethiopia. United Nations University Working Paper.

Anyanwu, J. C. 2011. International remittances and income inequality in Africa. *Review of Economic and Business Studies*, 7(5): 117-148.

Arouri, M., and Nguyen, C. V. 2018. Does international migration affect labour supply, non-farm diversification and welfare of households? Evidence from Egypt. *International Migration*, 56(1): 39-62.

Bang, J. T., Mitra, A., and Wunnava, P. V. 2016. Do remittances improve income inequality? An instrumental variable quantile analysis of the Kenyan case. *Economic Modelling*, 58: 394-402.

Barham, B., and Boucher, S. 1998. Migration, remittances, and inequality: Estimating the net effects of migration on income distribution. *Journal of Development Economics*, 55(2): 307-331.

Beyene, B. M. 2014. The effects of international remittances on poverty and inequality in. *Journal of Development Studies*, 50(10): 1380-1396.

Binford, L. 2003. Migrant remittances and (under) development in Mexico. *Critique of Anthropology*, 23(3): 305-336.

Black, R., Natali, C., and Skinner, J. 2006. *Migration and inequality*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Brown, L.A., and Sanders, R.L. 1981. Toward a development paradigm of migration, with particular reference to Third World settings. In *Migration decision making*, edited by G.F. De Jong and R. M. Gardner. New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 149-185.

Chiwuzulum Odozi, J., Taiwo Awoyemi, T., and Omonona, B. T. 2010. Household poverty and inequality: The implication of migrants' remittances in Nigeria. *Journal of Economic Policy Reform*, 13(2): 191-199.

Collyer, F. M. 2018. Global patterns in the publishing of academic knowledge: Global North, global South. *Current Sociology*, 66(1): 56-73.

De Brauw, A., Mueller, V., and Woldehanna, T. 2013. Does internal migration improve overall well-being in Ethiopia? Ethiopia Strategy Support Program II.

De Haan, A. 2000. Migrants, livelihoods and rights: The relevance of migration in development policies. Social Development Working Paper No. 4.

De Haas, H. 2007. Turning the tide? Why development will not stop migration. *Development and Change*, 38(5): 819-841.

De Haas, H. 2010. Migration and development: A theoretical perspective. *International Migration Review*, 44(1): 227-264.

De Haas, H. 2014. *Migration theory: Quo vadis?* International Migration Institute, University of Oxford.

Durand, J., and Massey, D. S. 1992. Mexican migration to the United States: A critical review. *Latin American Research Review*, 27(2): 3-42.

Ebeke, C. H., and Le Goff, M. 2011. Why do migrants' remittances reduce income inequality in some countries and not in others? CERDI Working Papers.

Faini, R., and Venturini, A. 1993. Trade, aid and migrations: Some basic policy issues. *European Economic Review*, 37(2-3): 435-442.

Fawcett, J. T., and Arnold, F. 1987. Explaining diversity: Asian and Pacific immigration systems. *Center for Migration Studies – Special Issue*, 5(3): 453-473.

Fonta, W., Onyukwu, O., and Nwosu, E. O. 2011. International remittance inflows and household welfare: Empirical evidence from Nigeria. *IISTE Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 2(3): 140-149.

Gustafsson, B., and Makonnen, N. 1993. Poverty remittances in Lesotho. *Journal of African Economies*, 2(1): 49-73.

Ha, W., Yi, J., Yuan, Y., and Zhang, J. 2016. The dynamic effect of rural-to-urban migration on inequality in source villages: System GMM estimates from rural China. *China Economic Review*, 37: 27-39.

Harris, J. R., and Todaro, M. P. 1970. Migration, unemployment and development: A two-sector analysis. *The American Economic Review*, 60(1): 126-142.

Hoddinott, J. 1992. Modelling remittance flows in Kenya. *Journal of African Economies*, 1(2): 206-232.

Hoddinott, J. 1994. A model of migration and remittances applied to Western Kenya. Oxford Economic Papers, pp. 459-476.

Kanbur, R., and Venables, A. J. 2005. Rising spatial disparities and development. United Nations University Policy Brief, No 3. United Nations University.

Knowles, J. C., and Anker, R. 1981. An analysis of income transfers in a developing country: The case of Kenya. *Journal of Development Economics*, 8(2): 205-226.

Kuznets, S. 1955. Economic growth and income inequality. *The American Economic Review*, 45(1): 1-28.

Lee, E. S. 1966. A theory of migration. *Demography*, 3(1): 47-57.

Lindley, A. 2007. Remittances in fragile settings: A Somali case study. HiCN Working Papers 27, Households in Conflict Network.

Lipton, M. 1980. Migration from rural areas of poor countries: The impact on rural productivity and income distribution. *World Development*, 8(1): 1-24.

Lucas, R. E., and Stark, O. 1985. Motivations to remit: Evidence from Botswana. *Journal of Political Economy*, 93(5): 901-918.

Mabogunje, A. L. 1970. Systems approach to a theory of rural-urban migration. *Geographical Analysis*, 2(1): 1-18.

Massey, D. S. 1990. Social structure, household strategies, and the cumulative causation of migration. *Population Index* 56: 3-26.

Massey, D. S., and Zenteno, R. M. 1999. The dynamics of mass migration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 96(9): 5328-5335.

Massey, D. S., Goldring, L., and Durand, J. 1994. Continuities in transnational migration: An analysis of nineteen Mexican communities. *American Journal of Sociology*, 99(6): 1492-1533.

Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., and Pellegrino, A. (1999). *Worlds in motion: Understanding international migration at the end of the millennium*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McCormick, B., and Wahba, J. 2003. Return international migration and geographical inequality: The case of Egypt. *Journal of African Economies*, 12(4): 500-532.

McKay, A. 2002. Inequality briefing. *Briefing Paper*, 1: 1-6.McKenzie, D. J. 2005. Measuring inequality with asset indicators. *Journal of Population Economics*, 18(2): 229-260.

McKenzie, D., and Rapoport, H. 2006. *Can migration reduce educational attainment? Evidence from Mexico*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Medie, P. A., and Kang, A. J. 2018. Global South scholars are missing from European and US journals. What can be done about it? *The Conversation,* 29 July.

Melamed, C., and Samman, E. 2013. Equity, inequality and human development in a post-2015 framework. UNDP, Human Development Report Office.

Mendola, M. 2012. Rural out-migration and economic development at origin: A review of the evidence. *Journal of International Development*, 24(1): 102-122.

Mines, R., and Massey, D. S. 1985. Patterns of migration to the United States from two Mexican communities. *Latin American Research Review*, 20: 104-123.

Morawska, E. 2007. International migration: Its various mechanisms and different theories that try to explain it. Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations; 1/07.

Morgan, J. 1962. The anatomy of income distribution. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 44(3): 270-283.

Mouton, J. 2010. The state of social science in sub-Saharan Africa. In *World Social Science Report: Knowledge Divides*, UNESCO Publishing, pp. 63-67.

Myrdal, G. 1957. *Rich lands and poor*. New York: Harper and Row.

Ngugi, E., Kipruto, S. and Samoei, P., 2013. Exploring Kenya's inequality: Pulling apart or pooling together? Kilifi County. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) and Society for International Development (SID). Nairobi, Kenya.

Notestein, F. W. 1945. Population: The long view. In *Food for the world*, edited by T. W. Schultz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 36-57.

Oberai, A. S., and Singh, H. K. 1980. Migration, remittances and rural development: Findings of a case study in the Indian Punjab. *International Labour Review*, 119(2): 229-241.

Okhankhuele, O. T., and Opafunso, O. Z. 2013. Causes and consequences of rural-urban migration in Nigeria: A case study of Ogun Waterside local government area of Ogun State, Nigeria. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences,* 16(1): 185-194.

Olowa, O. W., Awoyemi, T. T., Shittu, M. A., and Olowa, O. A. 2013. Effects of remittances on poverty among rural households in Nigeria. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 2(4): 263-284.

Oucho, J. O., and Gould, W. T. 1993. Internal migration, urbanization, and population distribution. In *Demographic change in sub-Saharan Africa,* edited by K.A. Foote, K.H. Hill, and L.G. Martin. Washington DC: National Academies Press, pp. 256-296.

Oyvat, C. and wa Gĩthĩnji, M., 2020. Migration in Kenya: Beyond Harris-Todaro. *International Review of Applied Economics*, 34(1): 4-35.

Piore, M. J. 1979. *Birds of passage: Migrant labor and industrial societies.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Plaza, S., Navarrete, M. and Ratha, D., 2011. *Migration and remittances household surveys in sub-Saharan Africa: Methodological aspects and main findings*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Quartey, P., 2006. The impact of migrant remittances on household welfare in Ghana. AERC Research Paper 158, Nairobi, Kenya.

Rahman, M. M. 2000. Emigration and development: The case of a Bangladeshi village. *International Migration*, 38(4): 109-130.

Ravenstein, E. G. (1885). The laws of migration. *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, 48(2): 167-235.

Ray, D., 1998. *Development economics*. New York: Princeton University Press.

Skeldon, R. 1990. *Population mobility in developing countries*. London: Belhaven Press.

Skeldon, R. 1997. *Migration and development: A global perspective*. London: Longman.

Solimano, A., 2001. *International migration and the global economic order: An overview*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Stark, O., and Lucas, R. E. 1988. Migration, remittances, and the family. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 36(3): 465-481.

Stark, O., and Taylor, J. E. 1991. Migration incentives, migration types: The role of relative deprivation. *The Economic Journal*, 101(408): 1163-1178.

Stark, O., Taylor, J. E., and Yitzhaki, S. 1986. Remittances and inequality. *The Economic Journal*, 96(383): 722-740.

Taylor, E. J. 1999. The new economics of labor migration and the role of remittances in the migration process. *International Migration*, 37(1): 63-88.

Vogler, M., and Rotte, R. 2000. The effects of development on migration: Theoretical issues and new empirical evidence. *Journal of Population Economics*, 13(3): 485-508.

Wight, D. 2008. Most of our social scientists are not institution based… they are there for hire – Research consultancies and social science capacity for health research in East Africa. *Social Science and Medicine*, 66(1): 110-116.

Wouterse, F. 2010. Remittances, poverty, inequality and welfare: Evidence from the Central Plateau of Burkina Faso. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 46(4): 771-789.

Zachariah, K. C., Mathew, E. T., and Rajan, S. I. (2001). Impact of migration on Kerala's economy and society. *International Migration*, 39(1): 63-87.

Zelinsky, W. 1971. The hypothesis of the mobility transition. *Geographical Review*, 61(2): 219-249.