

This report is based upon a study of migration and adaptation in new settlement areas in Brazil, supported by the Land Tenure Center, a cooperative research and training program of the American Nations, the Agency for International Development, and the University of Wisconsin. Computing services were provided by the Computing Center of the University of Wisconsin.

November 1968

RP No. 35

COMPARISON OF MIGRANTS IN TWO RURAL AND AN URBAN
AREA OF CENTRAL BRAZIL

by

E. A. Wilkening*

*E.A. Wilkening is Professor of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

All views, interpretations, recommendations, and conclusions expressed in this paper are the author's, and not necessarily those of the supporting or cooperating organizations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of a number of persons and agencies in providing the data for this study. The study was supported by the Land Tenure Center of the University of Wisconsin and by the Brazilian Mission of the Agency for International Development. Assistance was given by the officials of the National Institute for Agricultural Development (INDA) and the Brazilian Institute for Agrarian Reform (IBRA) in the selection of the study areas and in providing information about the problems of migration and settlement in Brazil.

The planning and field work in the município of Itumbiara was conducted with the assistance of representatives of the Association of Rural Credit and Assistance (ACAR), the Secretary of Agriculture and the local mayor. In the Federal District the Secretary of Agriculture provided extensive assistance in the planning of the study and in collecting the data. Information and other forms of assistance were provided by NOVACAP, IBRA, the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Health, IBGE, and INDA. Special encouragement and assistance in the form of office space and facilities were provided by the Ministry of Education under the direction of Dr. Armando Hildebrande.

The planning of the various phases of the study and the collection and tabulation of the data were carried out with the shared responsibility of João Bosco Guedes Pinto, now with Instituto Interamericano de Desarrollo Rural, Bogotá, Colombia; John C. van Es, professor of Rural Sociology, University of Illinois; José Pastore, professor of Sociology, University of São Paulo; and Fernando Rocha, professor of Rural Sociology, Rural University, Viçosa, Brazil.

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper began as a study of migration and adaptation in rural areas of the interior of Brazil. The intent was to determine the origins and the characteristics of the migrants, and the nature of the process of migration and settlement of people who moved to areas of population growth in the interior. The study was expanded to include migration to the urban area of Brasilia, thus providing an opportunity to compare the migration and adaptation of settlers in urban areas with settlers in rural areas.

Current settlement in the Brazilian interior results from a number of forces and developments. It is a part of the westward movement of people to the less populated area of the interior. While earlier settlers consisted mainly of miners and cattle grazers, the current group consists mainly of those concerned with the production of rice, corn, and in some areas bananas, pineapples, rubber, and other special crops. Because of its sparse settlement the interior is regarded as the region of opportunity for those who find land and job opportunities inadequate in other parts of Brazil. While some areas are productive, the vast upland areas are low in fertility and the seasonality of rainfall limits productivity. After about five years of cropping, productivity declines and crops are shifted to new land. Hence, the pattern of shifting cultivation is common here as in other of the semi-tropical areas of the country.

The building of Brasilia in the Central Plateau has given this part of the interior a new impetus since the city's completion in 1960. Asphalt roads from the south and east and a cleared road from the north to Brasilia have opened up this part of the interior to migrants from the more densely settled regions of Brazil. Despite the lack of natural resources and water transportation in the area, Brasilia has attracted people seeking employment in construction, in the government agencies, and in the shops and services needed for a capital city. These migrants to Brasilia are not typical of those who live in the large coastal cities or even in other inland cities since they consist of a higher proportion of construction workers and of persons connected with government agencies. Most come to the area of their own accord to seek employment in the new capital, but others were transferred by the government. The residents are urbanites but in a non-industrialized area.

For these reasons the comparison of the migrants and their adaptation in this newly created urban area with those in nearby and in more distant rural areas provides a somewhat unique opportunity. The situation provides an opportunity to compare the origin and the motivation of those who settle in rural and urban areas; it provides an opportunity to compare the degree of satisfaction and the level of objective attainments for those settling in rural and in urban

areas; and it provides an opportunity to compare the perspectives of rural and urban people with respect to rural and urban life for themselves and their children. These comparisons provide some insight into and suggest hypotheses about the significance of rural and urban residence, as well as about the process of settlement and adaptation in the rural and urban sectors of the developing countries of Latin America.

The literature on migration and adjustment to urban areas in Latin America is quite extensive.¹ The problem of inter-regional migration and its consequences has received less attention but is of special concern in Brazil.² Most research has been concerned with the causes of migration and with the problems of adjustment; Camargo has focused upon the significance of migration for economic development of the regions affected by the migration. While these studies have provided some understanding of the significance of migration and its major dimensions, they do not provide much information about the specific dynamics of migration or about the social and economic status, aspirations, and attitudes of the migrant, or how these factors affect the degree of adaptation in both rural and urban areas.

¹See Philip M. Hauser (ed.), Urbanization in Latin America (New York: International Documents Source, Columbia University Press, 1961); Bertram Hutchinson, "The Migrant Population of Urban Brazil," América Latina, Vol. 6, No. 2 (1963); and Glenn H. Beyer (ed.), The Urban Explosion in Latin America (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967).

²See L.A. Costa Pinto, "A mobilidade das populações," Digest Economico, Vol. 42 (1948), pp. 75-79; L.A. Costa Pinto, "A mobilidade das populações," Digest Economico, Vol. 41 (1948), pp. 94-97; Serviço de Informação Agrícola, Ministério de Agricultura, Rio de Janeiro, 1953; T. Pompeu Accioly Borge, Migrações Internas (Rio de Janeiro: Comissão Nacional de Política Agrária, 1955); Manuel Diegues, Jr., População e Propriedade da Terra no Brasil (Rio de Janeiro: Organização dos Estados Americanos, 1959), esp. pp. 111-123; Jacques Lambert, Os dois Brasil (Rio de Janeiro: INEP, 1959); and José Francisco Camargo, Exodo Rural no Brasil (Rio de Janeiro: Conquista, 1960).

Some General Hypotheses

The present study is concerned with migrants at their destinations rather than at the points of origin. For this reason little can be said about the selectivity of the migrants and the social and economic conditions affecting migration. We can compare the nature of the drawing power of different areas, consequences of the move as determined by the perception of the migrants, and the present status of the migrants with respect to certain objective criteria.

The hypotheses guiding the study are quite general in nature. It was expected that: 1) the urban area would draw people from a wider geographical area than the rural areas. The assumption is that rural people tend to move shorter distances to similar types of agricultural areas. A previous study of settlers in a colony in the state of Maranhão has shown that about two-thirds of the migrants come from the state itself, with few coming from the more distant highly populated areas of the northeast or the south.³ The result is in keeping with the Stouffer hypothesis that "the number of persons going a given distance is proportionate to the number of opportunities at that distance and inversely related to the number of intervening opportunities."⁴ Simply stated, farmers are likely to find opportunities suitable for them at a closer distance than are persons seeking urban employment.

Since living conditions and institutional services are poorly developed in rural areas it is expected that: 2) those who settle in rural areas are more likely to do so because of economic than other reasons, and that they will be more satisfied with the economic conditions than with health and education. Those living in the most distant rural area will be least satisfied with education and health facilities.

Finally, it was expected that: 3) rural migrants are more likely to rate the advantages of rural life higher than those who live in the city.

³Alvin Lackey and Geraldo Semenzato, Sociological Aspects of Settlement in Northern Brazil, Report of Interagency Team (Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development, June 1964).

⁴Samuel Stouffer, "Intervening Opportunities: A Theory Relating Mobility and Distance," American Sociological Review, Vol. 5 (1940), pp. 845-867.

Methodological Note

The data for this report were obtained by personal interview with the heads of households. The interviews in rural Itumbiara were made from April to June, 1966; those in Brasilia were made from October to December, 1966. The Itumbiara sample was selected as representative of the rural area outside of concentrations of population. The sample consisted roughly of one-tenth of the male heads of households living in the rural area. The rural Brasilia sample was less random, in that interviews were selected from ten areas, half of which were planned nucleos or colonies and half of which were areas in which invasores (squatters) were concentrated. The urban Brasilia sample consisted of one-fiftieth of all married couples living together; in half of the households the wife of the male respondent was also interviewed. Unless otherwise indicated the numbers upon which percentages are calculated to make the comparisons are as follows:

Itumbiara	291
Rural Brasilia	311
Urban Brasilia	653

The comparison of the three sets of data will be made under six headings: origin and previous residence, motivations for moving, consequences of the move, rural and urban perceptions of the farmer and of farm life, aspirations for sons and daughters, and lastly, personal and social characteristics. Unfortunately comparable data are not always available for the three samples. The Itumbiara study was completed first after which modifications were made in the interviews to obtain additional data.

II. ORIGIN AND PREVIOUS RESIDENCE OF THE MIGRANTS

The study of migrant groups in the interior provides an opportunity to tap the migration currents of Brazil. With information about father's birthplace, birthplace of respondent, and place of last residence, something of the range and direction of migration can be determined. Data on rural and urban residence before and after 14 years of age provides further indication of the direction of migration over the life span of the individual.

Birthplace of Respondent and Respondent's Father

Data were obtained on father's birthplace only for the rural and urban Brasília samples. Tables 1 and 2 show that a high proportion of the migrants to Brasília originated in the northeast-- 45.7 percent of the fathers and 41.7 percent of the respondents in urban Brasília were born there, indicating the interregional nature of the migration. Somewhat fewer of the rural migrants came from the northeast suggesting that the rural areas of the interior draw more from the surrounding rural areas. More of the urban migrants originated in the southern industrial areas of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro and more of the rural areas attracted foreign born migrants particularly Japanese.

Table 1. Birthplace of Respondent's Father

Region of Birth	Urban Brasília	Rural Brasília
Number of Cases	(653)	(311)
South	11.2 %	2.6 %
East	22.2	22.2
Central	5.2	17.7
Northeast	45.7	38.5
North	8.9	3.9
Foreign	6.3	13.5
No Reply	.5	1.6
Total	100	100

Table 2. Birthplace of Respondent

Region of Birth	Urban Brasília	Rural Brasília	Rural Itumbiara
Number of Cases	(653)	(311)	(291)
South	16.9 %	5.1 %	2.7 %
East	22.1	20.3	60.1
Central	8.1	23.2	6.5
Northeast	41.7	38.2	17.9
North	9.2	2.9	-
Foreign	2.1	10.3	12.7
No Reply	-	-	-
Total	100	100	100

The hypothesis that urban areas draw people from a wider geographical area than do rural areas is supported by the data. Only 8.1 percent of the urban, as compared with 23.2 percent of the rural respondents, were born in Central Brazil (Goiás primarily). The fact that 60.1 percent of the Itumbiara respondents were born in the east (Minas Gerais and Espírito Santo) also supports the hypothesis since the município adjoins the state of Minas Gerais. However, the really striking fact is that three-fourths of those in rural areas of Brasília and nine-tenths of those in the urban areas of Brasília were born outside the state of Goiás and other states in Central Brazil.

Table 3 shows that about half of those born in the northeast had moved from there to another place before coming to Brasília or to Itumbiara. They either had moved to the industrial south in São Paulo or Rio de Janeiro, or had moved to the central region not far from their present location. For example, while only 11.2 percent of the fathers of the respondents in urban Brasília were born in the south, 16.9 percent of the respondents were born there, and 31.2 percent of them had lived there just before coming to Brasília. While 17.9 percent of the present residents of Itumbiara were born in the northeast, only 7.6 percent lived there just before coming to Itumbiara.

Table 3. Last Residence of More than One Year of Respondent

Region of Last Residence	Urban Brasilia	Rural Brasilia	Rural Itumbiara
Number of Cases	(653)	(311)	(291)
South	31.2 %	18.3 %	2.1 %
East	19.0	19.9	54.6
Central	20.1	37.6	14.4
Northeast	21.9	18.4	7.6
North	7.2	4.5	1.0
Foreign	.5	1.3	-
No Reply	.2	-	20.3 ^a
Total	100	100	100

^aThese are nonmigrants.

These data suggest that the newly developing areas of the interior tend to draw from nearby areas rather than directly from the more distant regions of outmigration. Many people from the more distant regions are attracted by opportunities for work and settlement in the Federal District, but most of them had moved to several locations before settling in Brasilia and its environs. The construction of Brasilia and the building of asphalt roads leading to it accelerated the movement from the more densely settled areas of the coastal regions to the interior. Even among those moving to urban Brasilia directly from the south, half were born elsewhere, indicating that urban Brasilia was just as likely to draw people who had been born elsewhere as it was to draw those born and reared in the south. Of the rural Brasilia residents recruited from the south, very few had been born there, indicating that they had moved there from the northeast or elsewhere at an earlier age, and then moved to the Brasília area as opportunities opened up.

Rural-Urban Background

Table 4 shows that about half of the urban residents were reared on the farm and half in cities. In contrast, about 90 percent of the rural Brasilia residents were farm reared and ten percent urban reared. Of the urban residents, 40.7 percent had been on farms part of the time after 14 years of age and before coming to the cities. Since three-fifths of the urban residents had farm experience before 14 years of age, this means that about one-fifth of the urban residents had moved to the city before they were 14 years of age.

Table 4. Rural-Urban Residence Before 14 Years of Age and After 14 Years of Age

Type of Residence	Before 14 Years		After 14 Years	
	Urban Brasilia	Rural Brasilia	Urban Brasilia	Rural Brasilia
Number of Cases	(653)	(311)	(653)	(311)
Always Farm	32.6 %	74.3 %	- %	55.6 %
Mostly Farm	16.5	15.1	16.7	28.0
Mostly Cities	10.0	7.1	24.0	16.1
Always Cities	40.7	3.5	59.3	-
No Reply	.2	-	-	.3
Total	100	100	100	100

Three-fourths of the rural Brasilia settlers had spent all their early years on the farm. After 14 years of age, many of this group had moved to cities for a time since only 55.6 percent reported residence always on a farm after 14 years of age. This indicates the considerable shifting from farm to city and back to farm among the migrants to the rural areas around Brasilia. A similar pattern was also found in Itumbiara where 22.7 percent of the rural respondents had moved from farm to city and back to the farm. This circular type of moving appears to be more characteristic of the samples studied than of migrant populations in more industrialized nations.

Frequency of Moves

Persons who live in the interior of Brazil have already averaged two or more moves across county lines as adults and most will no doubt make further moves during their lifetime, since the median age of the respondents ranges from 36 for rural Brasilia to about 40 for rural Itumbiara (see Table 5). Those settling in the rural area of Brasilia have made the most moves between counties, with almost three-fifths having made three moves or more and one in nine having moved six times. Urban respondents of Brasilia have moved about as frequently. Migrants to Itumbiara had moved less frequently, with about half as many having moved four times or more. If we estimate the median number of moves at three for the rural Brasilia sample, each family moves across county lines every five years.

Table 5. Number of Moves Across County Lines

Number of Moves Between Counties	Urban Brasilia	Rural Brasilia	Rural Itumbiara
Number of Cases	(653)	(311)	(291)
None	1.8 %	11.9 %	20.3 %
1	20.5	15.4	27.8
2	23.1	14.5	20.6
3	21.4	22.2	14.8
4, 5	17.9	23.5	11.7
6 and Over	14.4	11.6	4.5
No Reply	.8	1.0	.3
Total	100	100	100

The high mobility rate of both rural and urban populations studied is probably not too atypical of many areas of the interior of Brazil. Many are already planning future moves. One-fourth of the rural Itumbiara sample had plans to move and another 14.4 percent were undecided; that is, four-fifths were considering moving within the near future.

Most of the migrants to the Brasilia area had lived in more than one other state and about one-third had lived in three other states before coming to Brasilia (see Table 6). The rural Itumbiara group is much more stable, although one-fifth had lived in two or more states other than Goiás. Over half had lived in only one other state. Apparently the better agricultural areas attracted migrants from nearby areas before the Brasilia boom, and these early migrants have been able to take advantage of the better economic opportunities before the arrival of more recent migrants.

Table 6. Number of Moves Between States

Number of Moves Between States	Urban Brasilia	Rural Brasilia	Rural Itumbiara
Number of Cases	(653)	(311)	(291)
None	0.9 %	9.6 %	24.1 %
1	37.2	30.5	55.3
2	27.3	24.4	11.0
3	21.7	21.9	6.9
4 or Over	12.7	13.1	2.4
No Reply	.2	.3	.3
Total	100	100	100

Marital Status When Migrating

Migrants to Central Brazil tend to move as a family. Most of the migrants to the rural areas moved with wife and children, but in urban Brasilia about as many (35.4 percent) came alone, with the wife and children coming later, as came with wife and children (32.0 percent). Also, about one-third of the urban migrants were single when they came to Brasilia, while this was true for only 23.5 percent of the rural Brasilia group and 17.5 percent of the Itumbiara group. Apparently occupational and living opportunities were more favorable for single men in this newly built urban center.

The decision to move was more often by mutual consent between husband and wife for the rural group than for the urban Brasilia group, yet all except 13.5 percent of the families who moved to urban Brasilia decided jointly about the move. If these figures are any indication, the wife holds as important an influence in moving as the husband for both rural and urban families.

Also, the decision to move was made in a very short time for both urban and rural residents. Three-fifths said they made the decision less than a month before moving.

III. MOTIVATIONS FOR MOVING

Decisions to move are usually made by individuals or families seeking to satisfy their needs. The decision was influenced by the conditions at the previous place of residence and by perception of opportunities elsewhere. This perception is determined by the information obtained about other locations. While data on motivations for moving are not highly reliable because they are based upon recall about past events, they do give some indication of the social and economic factors influencing moves.

Source of Information About Destination

Relatives and friends were the main sources of information about Brasilia before coming, with relatives being more important for the rural sector and friends more important for the urban (see Table 7). About one in five made a personal visit before coming. The written word was important for some of the urban migrants but for very few only of the rural migrants.

The radio was important as a secondary source of information. Strangers were also relied upon as a secondary source of information for one in seven of the rural migrants, with friends being the predominant secondary source for this group.

These data support the findings of other studies that relatives and friends are the main channel of information and influence in the migration process, particularly among low status people. Once persons are attracted to new locations, relatives and friends are sure to follow simply because they are more likely than anyone else to hear enough about the new place to justify a move. This results in the acceleration of immigration to an area for predominantly social rather than economic reasons, until the falling levels of economic opportunity discourage other friends and relatives from coming.

Table 7. Main Source of Information About Brasília Before Coming

Main Source of Information	Urban Brasília		Rural Brasília	
	Main Source	Second Source	Main Source	Second Source
Number of Cases	(653)	(653)	(311)	(311)
Personal Visits	19.6 %	11.0 %	18.3 %	6.1 %
Relatives	24.3	7.5	41.5	8.4
Friends	30.3	20.8	20.6	36.3
Strangers	3.4	6.1	5.8	14.8
Radio	8.6	14.7	5.5	11.9
Newspapers, Magazines	7.7	13.0	1.6	7.7
Other Sources	4.3	5.5	1.6	3.2
No Reply or Does Not Apply	1.9	21.3	5.1	11.6
Total	100	100	100	100

Resources for Moving

Most of the migrants to Brasília and to Itumbiara paid their own expenses. Less than 5 percent of the migrants to rural Brasília had their move subsidized by their employer or by the government, while 23.4 percent of the urban Brasília migrants had their move paid for by someone else. In the latter case, the government agency employing them usually paid for the move as an incentive to leave their residence in Rio de Janeiro and move to the new capital in the interior, isolated from friends, relatives, and the other advantages of coastal city life.

Sharecroppers in the rural area of Itumbiara frequently had their move paid for by their employer. The sharecropper was then indebted to work a year or two for the person who paid the passage. One-third of the sharecroppers reported that their move was financed in this manner. Since most of these persons had travelled by truck

with few belongings, the cost of the move was not great. Only one-third had money saved to pay for the move before they left, and one-seventh had to sell crops or something to pay for the move. About half said it was "difficult" to meet their expenses during the first year following their move.

Reasons for Leaving--Push Factors

Reasons for moving from one location to another are frequently divided into "push" and "pull" factors. The "push" factors are the reasons for leaving a location while the "pull" factors help to explain why the migrants come to the present location rather than to some other area. In reality, however, the decision to move involves conditions at both place of origin and place of destination simultaneously, making it somewhat artificial to distinguish between them. Nonetheless, a separate question was asked about the reason for leaving the previous place of residence and the reason for coming to the present location, in an attempt to distinguish "push" and "pull" factors (see Table 8).

Table 8. Main Reason for Leaving Place of Origin

Main Reason for Leaving Last Residence	Urban Brasilia (653)	Rural Brasilia (311)	Rural Itumbiara (232)
Job and Economic Conditions	52.4 %	45.0 %	42.2 %
Social Reasons	9.8	11.3	17.7
Condition of Services	4.3	6.8	1.7
Attraction of Brasilia	11.2	-	-
Transferred by Employer	11.3	-	-
Climate	3.7	0.3	2.2
Sickness	3.7	-	0.9
Others	1.1	17.0	2.1
No Reply or Does Not Apply	2.6	19.6	33.2
Total	100	100	100

As expected, most of the reasons given for leaving the place of previous residence were of an economic nature, such as the lack of jobs, lack of land, not enough land, and land wearing out. Those moving to the rural area of Brasilia gave lack of jobs more frequently than they gave lack of land, indicating that they might have remained if nonfarm jobs had been available. Conflicts with landlords was given as a reason for leaving the previous place by 6.5 percent of the migrants to Itumbiara and by 9.0 percent of the migrants to rural Brasilia. These are probably underestimates of the difficulties with landlords. These conflicts with landlords, added to other social reasons, make up from 10 to 20 percent of the reasons for leaving the previous residence. Furthermore, among those giving economic reasons, growth in the size of the family made the previous plot of land too small, so a move became necessary. This was true for about one in seven of the rural Brasilia migrants.

About 4 percent of the urban Brasilia migrants gave lack of schools, doctors, and other services as the primary reason for moving, and 6.8 percent of the rural Brasilia migrants gave this reason. Hence, while these services were not readily available in the rural areas of Brasilia, they were probably worse in the areas from which they came. This reply reflects the lack of such services in most rural areas of Brazil.

Reasons for Coming--Pull Factors

Economic factors are also most important in attracting families to both rural and urban areas of the interior. But, in keeping with the second hypothesis, those who settled in the rural areas more often gave economic reasons than those who moved to the city. In Itumbiara the attraction of relatives and friends is also great, while this was true for only about 10 percent of those moving to the Brasilia area (see Table 9). Brasilia was also seen as the "city of the future" and as a place where there would be a new social as well as physical and economic climate. Almost one-third of the urban residents and one-sixth of the rural residents gave this type of reason as the main reason for coming to Brasilia. This answer shows the influence of the pioneering and adventurous spirit in the settlement of the new urban as well as rural areas of Brazil.

Despite the problems of moving, many plan to move from their present residence. One-fourth of those interviewed in rural Itumbiara planned to move out of the county in the next few years and another 14.4 percent were uncertain about plans to move. Even these figures are conservative, since in the re-interview of 100 sharecroppers seven months later after a change of crop season, almost half were located at a different farm, indicating the high degree of shifting from farm to farm each year on the part of the tenants and workers. Only 10.3 percent

Table 9. Reasons for Coming to Brasilia

Type of Reason	Urban Brasilia	Rural Brasilia
Job and Economic Opportunities	43.8 %	63.7 %
Social Reasons	9.5	9.3
Services	2.9	1.9
Attraction of Brasilia as Place of Opportunity, etc.	29.1	17.7
Transferred (Involuntary)	7.5	-
Climate	2.8	1.3
Others	0.5	0.3
No Reply or Does Not Apply	3.7	5.8
Total	100	100

of the rural Brasilia respondents said they had "thought of leaving" the Federal District, perhaps indicating a higher degree of stability for this group located near an urban center.

About three-fourths of this 10 percent wanted to move from rural Brasilia for economic reasons--financial, lack of land, and poor soil--while the remainder wanted to move to be nearer relatives or to be less socially isolated, with a few wanting to move because of sickness. Those wanting to move from Itumbiara more frequently gave lack of education and health services as their reason for desiring a move. These services are very poor in the rural areas of the municipio. About one in seven of those planning to move from Itumbiara said the owner had asked them to do so.

While the urban Brasilia residents were not asked whether they had thought of leaving, 16.5 percent said they would not have come if they "knew what they know now" about Brasilia, and another 6.4 percent were uncertain. Hence, as is so common in Brazil, many move to new places with the hope that things will be better but are then faced with worse conditions than before. So, they continue their search for better circumstances when a hopeful opportunity arises.

IV. CONSEQUENCES OF THE MOVE

To what extent are the reasons for moving justified? How does the migrant view his situation after having made the move to a rural as compared with an urban area? Answers to these questions were sought by asking about things liked and disliked about Brasilia, and by asking the respondents in Itumbiara and rural Brasilia to compare their present and previous locations with respect to various conditions.

Things Liked Most About Brasilia

The favorable climate of Brasilia is one of its greatest attractions to people who come from the more hot and humid lower altitudes of Brazil. Over half of both urban and rural groups gave the favorable climate as either first or second response to the question as to what they liked most about Brasilia (see Table 10).

Table 10. Things Liked Most About Brasilia

Type of Things Liked	Urban Brasilia		Rural Brasilia	
	First	Second	First	Second
Economic and Job Related	19.9 %	16.4 %	22.8 %	27.7 %
Social	4.9	8.4	2.6	8.4
Services	14.7	21.1	16.7	24.4
Brasilia City	9.6	13.5	2.6	2.9
Independence	4.4	6.7	8.7	8.0
Climate	41.5	15.3	39.9	20.6
Everything	1.2	.6	4.2	2.3
Others	.2	.2	1.0	.6
No Reply or Does Not Apply	3.6	17.8	1.6	5.1
Total	100	100	100	100

When the second response is considered, schools, doctors, and other services were given about as frequently as better job opportunities. Although many came to Brasilia because of word passed on through friends and relatives, few gave "social" advantages in Brasilia as primary or secondary satisfactions. As many as 23.1 percent of those in urban Brasilia were most impressed with the city itself--its plan and its novelty as a place to live. This type of response, together with those which favored most the school, health, and other services provided, indicates the high value placed upon non-economic considerations by migrants to the new capital. They seem willing to put up with lack of better job opportunities and physical facilities, instead hoping to somehow take advantage of the services provided in this more pleasant setting.

Things Liked Least About Brasilia

The planning of Brasilia has made transportation difficult for those who live in the satellite cities. This problem, and the lack of water, sewage, and other facilities in the satellite and rural areas are the most frequent "gripes" of those who live in and around Brasilia. The long bus rides for those who must travel from the satellite cities to the central city every day, plus the lack of commercial places in the neighborhood, add to the time and effort in shopping--the most common type of complaint (see Table 11). Others

Table 11. Things Liked Least About Brasilia

Type of Thing Liked Least	Urban Brasilia		Rural Brasilia	
	First	Second	First	Second
Economic and Job Related	4.3 %	5.4 %	10.6 %	5.1 %
Social	8.1	4.0	6.1	2.6
Services	23.9	26.3	25.1	28.9
Material	30.6	10.1	25.4	18.0
Housing	5.8	2.6	0.3	.6
Sickness	4.9	.8	1.9	.6
Other	1.8	2.0	.3	-
No Reply, or Does Not Apply	20.6	48.9	30.2	44.0
Total	100	100	100	100

don't like the isolation of the planned city and the lack of diversion in the city, which has not yet attracted the entertainment features of the larger cities. Only two of the satellite cities have a central "square" typical of all Brazilian cities, and one of these is a spontaneous satellite and not a part of the final plan. Housing, while consisting of board shacks for many, is rated as a problem by only a few. Job and economic problems are also mentioned by relatively few of those living in the urban area but somewhat more often by those in the rural area of Brasilia.

Apparently aesthetic and other considerations took precedence over concern for the convenience and cost of living to the residents during the planning of the city. Much time is taken up in travelling to work and for shopping. While there is bus service, the buses are very crowded during the morning and evening hours, and the distances between the place of work in the government ministries and the shopping areas are too great for walking. The city of Brasilia is built for the automobile but less than one-fourth of the families have one.

Comparison of Conditions in Place of Origin and Place of Destination

Most moves are made with the hope that conditions will be better after the move, although improvement cannot be expected in all aspects. Since the main reason for moving is economic it is expected that migrants would perceive the economic gains as most important. This would be followed by social reasons which were given by 10 percent of the Brasilia migrants and 18 percent of the Itumbiara migrants as reasons for moving.

Table 12 presents a comparison of the conditions at the present residence with those at the previous residence for the rural samples only. Unfortunately, only over-all comparisons were obtained for the urban Brasilia sample. It appears that the vast majority of those moving to rural Brasilia were "happier" than they were in the place from which they came. Contrary to expectations, this was not so true for the urban migrants (70 percent as compared to 83.3 percent) as it was for the rural migrants to Brasilia. However, the rural migrants to Itumbiara were much more likely to be dissatisfied with their present circumstances in general. Only slightly over half of the migrants to this area, about 250 miles from Brasilia, felt that they were "better off" than they were in the place from which they came. It should be remembered that more of the migrants to this area came from better farming areas than did migrants to Brasilia.

Table 12. Comparison of Conditions Between Place of Origin and Place of Destination

	Rural Brasilia	Rural Itumbiara (232)
Working Conditions		
Worse	6.8 %	26.3 %
Same	7.1	23.3
Better	83.0	50.0
No Reply or Does Not Apply	3.2	.4
Income		
Worse	10.3	28.0
Same	7.1	31.5
Better	79.1	40.0
No Reply or Does Not Apply	3.6	.4
Living Conditions		
Worse	20.9	-
Same	8.4	-
Better	67.5	-
No Reply or Does Not Apply	3.2	-
Children's Education		
Worse	8.0	39.2
Same	9.0	20.7
Better	74.3	34.9
No Reply or Does Not Apply	8.7	5.1
Health Facilities		
Worse	9.0	42.5
Same	9.0	15.9
Better	78.1	40.5
No Reply or Does Not Apply	3.9	.9
Friends		
Worse	14.1	22.8
Same	32.8	47.4
Better	49.8	28.9
No Reply or Does Not Apply	3.2	.9
Food		
Worse	6.4	-
Same	21.9	-
Better	68.5	-
No Reply or Does Not Apply	3.2	-
General		
Worse	2.9	15.9
Same	10.6	29.7
Better	83.3	52.2
No Reply or Does Not Apply	3.2	2.1

Migrants to rural Brasilia felt they were better off in all respects than they were in the place from which they came. Even half thought that they were better off with respect to friends in Brasilia. Only contacts with relatives were more often worse than favorable after the move to the Brasilia area. Forty-four percent felt that contacts with relatives were worse and only 31.5 percent felt that they were better. It is also worth noting that about half of the migrants to rural Brasilia felt that their relationships with their wife and with their children were better in Brasilia than in their previous residence, and less than 2 percent felt they were worse. This suggests that the lack of established traditional social patterns in Brasilia resulted in more open and equalitarian relationships between male and female and between young and old. Personal accounts by respondents in urban Brasilia as well as in rural Brasilia support this finding. A few high status persons pointed to the greater freedom of women to work and to get an education in Brasilia, and comments were frequent that youth was freer and had better educational opportunities there. Such freedom, of course, was deplored by some as contrary to acceptable moral standards.

Working conditions were more favorable for about half of the migrants to Itumbiara and worse for about one-fourth. This situation no doubt reflects the decline in productivity of the land since the time of first migration. It may also reflect the waning of the optimistic aura surrounding the move and its advantages with the passage of time. The move to Itumbiara has not led to an improved economic position for most, since considerably less than half reported that their income was better than in the place from which they last moved. For the Itumbiara migrants, education and health facilities were reported as worse more often than better. In great contrast, a small proportion--less than 10 percent--of the rural migrants to Brasilia reported these conditions worse in their present location. The majority of the rural migrants to Itumbiara reported that the number of their friends was about the same as in their previous location.

While these reports of satisfaction with conditions in their present as compared with previous residence may be subject to reporting error, the general import of the finding holds. Moves to rural areas of economic opportunity supported by an urban market and employment hold considerable attraction over more isolated rural areas, despite the low productivity of the land in the rural area surrounding Brasilia. The institutional services are greatly superior in the Federal District where there has been an attempt to provide these services. This advantage together with the optimism surrounding the new capital is likely to hold most of the present residents and to attract others to the rural and to the urban area despite the limitation on economic opportunities. On the other hand, those moving to rural areas with fewer economic opportunities

and with a lower level of services will include a higher proportion of dissatisfied persons and result in less stability of residence. These factors help explain the pattern of shifting to a new location every few years among a high proportion of the rural population of this part of Brazil.

Conditions for Returning to the Farm

Since over half (55.7 percent) of the urban migrants to Brasilia come from rural areas, what are the conditions under which they might return to farm life? It is frequently stated that too many persons are moving to urban areas without work opportunities. Can counter opportunities be provided in the rural areas? About 16 percent of the urban residents of Brasilia said they would be interested in returning to farming if they could buy farm property. About half of this number felt they would definitely need more knowledge about farming if they returned. Few of the urban residents had to leave the farm because of indebtedness, eviction by the landlord, or similar critical reasons. For most, the city provided an "easier place to find a job." Hence, while some would be interested in returning to the farm if land credit and technical assistance were provided, these conditions would probably not attract very many unless the terms of land ownership and credit assistance were very favorable.

Almost all of those presently living in the rural areas of Brasilia are interested in technical assistance programs. However, information is lacking about the rural nucleos--34.4 percent of rural respondents didn't know about them when asked. And only two-thirds of those who had heard of them said they would like to live in a nucleo. These responses suggest that living in a nucleo is not regarded as desirable by a significant proportion of those who knew about them. Unless the terms of possession, credit, and technical assistance are provided, many apparently prefer their "squatter" status to being a settler in a nucleo in the Federal District, since 57 percent of the sample were "squatters" who lived outside the nucleo.

V. RURAL AND URBAN PERCEPTIONS OF THE FARMER AND OF RURAL LIFE

The history of Brazilian agriculture is centered around the commercial production of sugar, coffee, cocoa, and other crops of export value. There is no family farm tradition in Brazil except in the areas settled by colonists from northern Europe within the past 75 years. This situation gave rise to the predominant

pattern of large latifundia, at first worked with slaves and then with hired workers and sharecroppers. Manual work was for the lower class which had little opportunity to become independent farmers. In the frontier areas a farmer was able to clear land and gain title to it after a few years, but few raised their level of living beyond that of the small owners who frequently worked for large owners for wages.

In his study of a settlement near Rio de Janeiro, Galjart finds that the patron-client pattern of social structure had influenced the acquiring of land, the participation in the cooperative and the motivation to depend upon one's own resources.⁵ Furthermore, he found that the "Grand Tradition" in Brazilian agriculture has not supported the values of subsistence production, family labor, and conservation of resources.

The present study obtained data on the nature of attitudes toward rural life and toward work on the land. The intent was to relate these attitudes to the farm practices followed and to the level of economic success. The data allows comparison of the perceptions of rural and urban migrants to determine how their views of agriculture and rural life are related to their present residence. Both rural and urban interviewees were asked to respond to a series of eight statements indicating their attitudes toward work in agriculture and the conditions of life in rural areas (see Table 13).

Two statements pertained to the economic contribution of those who work the land. For these two questions the responses of both rural and urban residents were similar. About 55 percent of both groups agreed that "no one values those who work the land nowadays." A few more of the rural than of the urban residents disagreed with the statement. Only about two-fifths of each group agreed that "the government should stop the farmers from leaving the farms." While the implication of this statement is ambiguous it probably means that farmers can make a greater contribution by remaining on the land than by moving to the city, and that farmers should be helped to remain on the land.

Two statements pertained to attitudes toward the personal qualities of persons who work in agriculture. Responses reflect

⁵Benno Galjart, Itoquof: Old Habits and New Practices in a Brazilian Land Settlement (Wageningen: Center for Agricultural Publishing and Documentation, 1968), pp. 88-104.

Table 13. Attitudes Toward Agriculture and Rural Life

	Rural Brasília ^a			Urban Brasília		
	Agree	Uncer- tain	Dis- agree	Agree	Uncer- tain	Dis- agree
No one gives much value to those who work the land.	55.0%	7.4%	37.0%	54.7%	11.5%	33.8%
The government should stop the farmers from leaving the land.	42.4	12.9	44.1	38.3	13.0	48.7
People who do work in agriculture are more intelligent than those who work in the city.	34.4	30.5	34.1	12.9	22.8	64.3
Farm workers have bad characters.	5.1	10.9	83.3	79.0	12.4	8.6
Working with Nature is better than working in the office.	93.9	3.5	2.3	56.4	18.7	25.0
Work on the farm is more pleasant than that in the city.	92.3	3.9	3.2	49.8	21.1	29.1
Life in the country will never be as good as that in the city.	14.1	13.5	72.0	40.7	20.7	38.6
Wanting to, a farmer can have a better life than a merchant.	72.7	15.4	11.6	59.3	15.5	25.3

^aThe percentages do not quite total 100 since from 1 to 3 cases not reporting are not included.

the stereotypes held about rural people. While about two-thirds (64.3 percent) of the urban residents disagreed with the statement: "People who work in agriculture are more intelligent than those who work in the city," only one-third (34.1 percent) of the rural residents disagreed. The differences were even greater in response to the statement: "Farm workers have bad characters," referring to their level of morality. Only 5.1 percent of the rural group agreed with this statement as compared with 79.0 percent of the urban group. These urban responses reflect quite strongly the stereotype of the rural person and the low status of the rural worker. This low status applies to anyone who works the land whether owner, tenant, or laborer. The effects of such attitudes are also reflected in the desire of farmers to have their sons move out of agriculture if possible, and in the tendency to hire field workers as soon as one is able to do so.

The remaining four statements have to do with reactions to the rural area as a place to work and to live. Considerable differences are found between rural and urban residents for all of these statements. Perhaps the greatest consensus is that "working with nature is better than working in an office." Almost all (93.9 percent) of the rural residents agreed with this statement as did 56.4 percent of the urban. A somewhat smaller percentage (49.8 percent) of the urban group agreed with the statement that "work on the farm is more pleasant than that in the city." But even this percentage is high, suggesting that farm work may indeed be more pleasant than some types of work in the city. This response could come from the urban unskilled worker who has little control over his work situation.

Optimism about the life on the land does exist. About two-thirds (72.0 percent) of the rural residents and two-fifths (38.6 percent) of the urban residents disagree that "life in the country will never be as good as that in the city." Slightly more of the urban residents are pessimistic than are optimistic about the opportunities for rural life, but three-fifths (59.3 percent) of the urban residents feel that "wanting to, a farmer can have a better life than a merchant." This statement compares country life with a specific urban occupation.

Responses to these statements tell a great deal about the way rural and urban people see rural life and those men who work the land. First, both rural and urban people agree that those who work the land rank lower in prestige than does the average urban worker. Furthermore, both groups are split about equally as to whether the government should do anything about keeping the farmer on the land, but here the similarities stop. Most urban people agree that agricultural workers are less intelligent and have "bad moral characters," while rural people are divided about the intelligence

of farm people and almost unanimously agree that farm workers don't have "bad moral characters." But when asked about the working and living conditions of the farmer, about half of the urban sample agreed that work on the farm is more pleasant than work in the city and that a farmer can have a better life than the merchant. This suggests that the urban person distinguishes between the farm worker as a person and the place in which he works. While he degrades the farm worker he sees the advantages of the rural life which the worker makes possible. Perhaps this is essentially the distinction between the status and role of the worker and that of the owner who lives in the country but may have others to do the work. There are advantages to living in the country, at least part of the time, if one doesn't have to do the physical work. The ownership of land provides a place to spend leisure time and provides prestige and economic security in the face of monetary inflation.

The low status of the farmer and the lack of social as well as economic opportunities for improving that status apparently make farm life something to be shunned rather than desired, even for many who have been brought up on the farm. Few of those presently living on the land want their sons to become farmers even though they praise the working and living advantages of the farm. Perhaps comparisons with respect to the social, education, and other aspects of rural and urban living would have revealed further explanations for the paradoxical attitudes of both rural and urban residents toward agriculture and rural life. The responses reported here do suggest some clues about both rural and urban Brazilians' views of agriculture and rural life, and some reasons why it does not attract the entrepreneurs and yeomen of the soil.

VI. ASPIRATIONS FOR SONS AND DAUGHTERS

Educational and occupational aspirations for children indicate the value placed upon achievement and upon status. At the same time, these aspirations reflect the actual opportunities available for education and occupational attainment. Because of differences in the way the questions were framed, comparisons will first be made between the two rural samples and then between the urban and the rural samples of Brasilia.

Educational Aspirations

The effect of educational opportunities upon aspirations is dramatized by the great differences between Itumbiara and rural Brasilia in education aspirations for sons (see Table 14). Excluding those who did not respond to the question, over half of the respondents from Itumbiara desired only a primary school education for their sons and only about one-fifth wanted their sons to get at least some university education. For rural Brasilia the proportions are reversed. Over half wanted university education for their sons and only 10 percent wanted no more than a primary school education. The availability of a university in Brasilia has apparently given many the hope that their sons will be able to obtain university training. The greater accessibility of secondary schools in the Federal District also brings higher education closer to reality for the average person. Secondary school courses are offered at night for those who work during the day. Thus the promotion of education at all levels in Brasilia has apparently led to much higher educational aspirations than in other areas in Brazil.

Table 14. Level of Schooling Desired for Sons

Schooling Desired for Sons	Rural Brasilia	Rural Itumbiara
Primary (1-5 years)	9.6 %	43.0 %
Junior High (6-9)	15.4	9.3
Senior High (10-12)	10.6	7.2
University	53.1	19.9
No Reply or Does Not Apply	10.9	20.6
Total	100	100

When asked how much schooling their sons will receive if they remain in the Federal District, the responses are somewhat less than the ideal aspiration. While over half of the respondents of rural Brasilia want university education for their sons only 36.1 percent expect that they will get that far. Almost one-third expect that they will receive no schooling or primary schooling only, and another third expect secondary school will be the limit

of their sons' education. The respondents of urban Brasilia are much more optimistic about schooling for their sons, although surprisingly about one-fifth expect they will receive no schooling. But over three-fifths expect their sons will go to the university, with only 15.3 percent expecting they will stop at the secondary school level (see Table 15).

Table 15. Amount of Schooling Which Sons Are Expected to Receive

Amount of Schooling Sons are Expected to Receive	Urban Brasília	Rural Brasília
None	19.1 %	13.5 %
Primary	2.0	17.7
Junior High	8.3	20.9
Senior High	7.0	11.3
University	61.9	36.1
No Reply or Does Not Apply	1.7	.6
Total	100	100

Occupational Aspirations

Job aspirations for sons are also high in Brasilia. Over half (55.3 percent) of the rural respondents want their sons to go into professional or entrepreneurial positions and another 14.8 percent want them to go into skilled, white collar, trade, or semi-professional jobs. The comparable figures for urban Brasilia are 63.1 percent and 11.4 percent. Respondents of Itumbiara, however, have lower aspirations for their sons. Only 16.8 percent give entrepreneurial or professional occupations and 41.0 percent give skilled work, white collar, trade, or semi-professional jobs as the occupational level desired for their sons. A high proportion (26.1 percent) gave bank teller or clerk typist as the type of job desired for sons. These represent white collar jobs which do not require much education and yet provide relatively easy work and contact with professionals and entrepreneurs.

It is surprising that very few of either of the rural groups wanted their sons to go into farming. Only 5.5 percent of the rural Itumbiara group wanted their sons to become farm owners and 1.0 percent farm workers or sharecroppers, which are the predominant occupations of the fathers. While the exact percentage of those in rural Brasilia who wanted their sons to go into farming is not known, it is less than 2 percent.

Aspirations for daughters are much lower than for sons with respect to occupation. In rural Brasilia over half, 52.7 percent, want their daughters to have a skilled or white collar job and 11.6 percent a professional type job, usually teacher. In urban Brasilia the percentage desiring teaching or similar work for their daughters is 23.3 percent, with 46.6 percent indicating clerical type of work. About one-fifth of both the rural and the urban group felt that their daughters should marry without any particular job.

When asked what type of job sons were expected to have only 22.8 percent of those in rural Brasilia said professional or entrepreneurial type jobs, less than half the number who wanted such occupations for their sons. About one-third expected their sons to obtain skilled, white collar, trade, or semi-professional jobs, and another 14.8 percent expected their sons would have unskilled or semi-skilled types of work, with 27.6 percent not responding to the question.

If these figures are valid, it appears that while most of the respondents are employed in agriculture, few want their sons to remain in this occupation. Furthermore, few expect their sons will remain in agriculture after they receive their education. Unless occupations connected with agriculture are given more status and security they will continue to attract those who have no other choice due to lack of education or opportunity. The professions of law, medicine, pharmacy, banking, and business hold the highest attraction. Having attained status in a profession or business, however, one may enter farming without a loss of prestige, for economic or for other reasons. A farm may provide security and profit, but not prestige unless it is a large farm operated by tenants or workers, with the owner living in town.

What is Best for Sons and Daughters

Whether sons and daughters are expected to stay in Brasília, decide for themselves, or leave Brasilia, indicates parents' attitude toward Brasilia as well as toward the freedom to be allowed children in making their decisions (see Table 16). Very few of either the rural or urban group felt that sons or daughters should

Table 16. What is Best for Sons and Daughters When They Are of Age

Type of Response	Urban Brasília		Rural Brasília	
	Sons	Daughters	Sons	Daughters
Leave Brasília	2.9 %	3.4 %	1.0 %	0.0 %
Let Them Decide	45.3	33.7	20.6	17.7
Stay in Brasília	39.5	51.3	71.7	76.5
No Reply or Does Not Apply	12.3	11.7	6.7	5.1
Total	100	100	100	100

leave Brasília when they became 18 years of age. However, about twice the proportion of the urban as of the rural group said "let them decide for themselves." The norms of the urban area apparently allow greater freedom for the children's own decisions.

While the percentage who felt that daughters should decide for themselves was less for both rural and urban groups, the differences are not great. This finding provides support for the notion that Brasília has provided a social climate favorable to greater equality for women than in other areas of Brazil.

It is worth noting that 18.8 percent of the urban wives worked to earn money while only 9.0 percent of the rural wives did, although 28.6 percent of the rural wives worked in the fields to assist in the farm work. Most of the children also assisted in field work in the rural area.

VII. PERSONAL AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

Family Structure

Contrary to what might be expected, the rural sector has a higher proportion of nuclear family households than does the urban sector. Seven out of ten (71.7 percent) of the rural households consist of nuclear families without relatives or non-relatives, as compared with 58.0 percent for the urban. The urban household more frequently has non-relatives--13.8 percent as compared with 7.4 percent for the rural sector--and also is more likely to have relatives of the same generation, 11.8 percent as compared with

3.5 percent. Apparently, households in the city attract relatives and friends or boarders who are seeking employment in the city. The more isolated rural areas do not attract persons outside the nuclear family to the same extent. Only 8 to 9 percent of both urban and rural families have parents of one of the spouses living with them. The nuclear family household, then, is by far the dominant pattern in both rural and urban areas of this part of the Brazilian interior.

Schooling

One of the main distinctions between the rural and the urban migrant is in the level of schooling (see Table 17). Over two-fifths (43.4 percent) of the rural respondents of Brasília had no schooling, as compared with 15.5 percent for the urban group. Only 10.9 percent of the rural group had more than a primary school education while 38.6 percent of the urban group had that much. The rural sample of Itumbiara had a still lower educational level--58.8 percent with no schooling and only 0.7 percent with six years or more of schooling.

Table 17. Years of Schooling of Husbands for Rural and Urban Sectors of Brasília and Itumbiara

Years of Schooling	Urban Brasília	Rural Brasília	Rural Itumbiara
Number of Cases	(653)	(311)	(291)
No School	15.5 %	43.4 %	59.4 %
1-3 years	22.7	28.9	35.2
4-5 years	23.0	16.4	4.8
6-9 years	18.5	6.4	.7
10-12 years	9.6	1.9	-
13-16 years	5.4	1.3	-
16 and Over	5.1	1.3	-
No Reply	.3	.3	-
Total	100	100	100

Wives of the rural Brasilia sector are a little more likely than their husbands to have some schooling, while in urban Brasilia husbands are more likely to have schooling and to reach the higher levels of schooling. Only 4.5 percent of the urban wives had some university education while 10.5 percent of the urban husbands had that much.

The contrast between rural and urban sectors is even more distinct with respect to reading and writing. Only 13.9 percent of the urban husbands said they could not read the newspapers as compared to 55.9 percent of the rural husbands of Brasilia and 56.4 percent of the rural husbands of Itumbiara.

Living Conditions in Rural and Urban Areas

Having a house in the town or city is a mark of status of the rural person in Brazil. Almost one-fifth of the rural residents of Brasilia have a house in the city and 10 percent of the rural residents of Itumbiara hold such a distinction. The majority of the urban residents live in wooden huts, not much better than the housing for rural residents. This situation reflects the rapid growth of Brasilia and the lack of available housing. However, among those living in the central city of Brasilia almost all dwell in apartments or brick houses. The highest proportion of the rural residents of Brasilia as well as of Itumbiara live in small shacks made of mud and sticks (pau-a-pique). These shacks are relatively easily constructed but offer little space, light, or privacy for family members. The wooden huts of urban Brasilia are hastily constructed with the roofs frequently made of pieces of tin and boards only partially successful in preventing rain leakage.

Household possessions and utilities also differentiate the groups (see Table 18). The greatest difference between rural and urban areas is in the utilities of water, sewage, and electricity. Electricity and running water are available to three-fifths of the families in the urban areas but to only 4 to 6 percent of those in the rural areas. A sewage system is not established completely in any of the satellites of Brasilia, hence it is available to only about one-third of the urban residents and to only 5 percent of the rural, most of whom live in the nucleos. Only 29.6 percent of those in rural Brasilia have cesspools--nevertheless an improvement over no facilities at all.

Because of the lack of wood, gas stoves are used by most of those living in the slum areas as well as in the central city of Brasilia, but by fewer in the rural areas. Refrigerators are standard equipment only among the middle and upper income groups; hence very few in the rural areas have them. The sewing machine is the most common convenience in the rural household but hardly any have washing machines.

Table 18. Percentage With Household Possessions and Utilities

Item	Urban Brasilia	Rural Brasilia	Rural Itumbiara
House in City	100 %	18 %	10 %
Brick House	46.4	30.0	37.5
Electricity	53.9	4.2	5.5
Running Water	59.4	6.1	6.2
Well	- ^a	- ^a	58.8
Sewage System	36.4	5.1	- ^a
Cesspool	59.9	29.6	- ^a
Water Filter	74.7	43.1	- ^a
Sewing Machine	- ^a	- ^a	58.4
Gas Stove	89.1	24.1	3.4
Refrigerator	40.6	3.9	4.5
Washing Machine	25.6	0.6	- ^a
Automobile	22.5	11.9	3.4
Radio	78.1	51.4	46.0
Television	37.4	2.9	- ^a
Daily Newspaper	- ^a	- ^a	4.8

^a Data not obtained.

The radio is the only form of mass communication which reaches around half of the rural residents--51.4 percent in rural Brasilia and 46.0 percent in Itumbiara. The daily newspaper is common for the middle and upper class urban residents but very few rural residents receive or read a newspaper regularly. Television is becoming available to a few rural residents of Brasilia but to none in Itumbiara.

Food Habits

The type of food consumed indicates consumption levels in both rural and urban areas (see Table 19). Beef is the most common meat for urbanites but chicken is most common for rural residents in Itumbiara. Pork is a more common fare for rural people but is eaten more than once a week by less than a third. Butter is an urban product, hence used only by those who are close to a market or who have refrigeration. Only 11.3 percent of the rural Itumbiara group used butter more than once a week while 43.7 percent of the rural Brasilia group used it that frequently. Milk is more frequently used by those in rural Itumbiara (where cattle are more common) than by those in rural Brasilia. Bread is also an urban product; hence less than a third in rural Itumbiara had it more than once a week. Of the animal products only eggs are about equally accessible to more than half of the rural and urban residents. Of course, rice and beans remain the staple food for all.

Table 19. Percentage Eating Various Foods More Than Once a Week

Type of Food	Urban Brasilia	Rural Brasilia	Rural Itumbiara
Beef	88.5 %	55.0 %	24.1 %
Chicken	20.2	52.7	54.3
Pork	21.7	28.0	32.0
Butter	81.0	43.7	11.3
Milk	77.2	44.4	56.4
Eggs	87.4	87.5	73.5
Bread	97.4	50.5	29.6
Beans	99.7	98.1	98.2
Rice	100.0	99.4	99.6

VIII. SUMMARY

The comparison of two rural and one urban sample in Central Brazil reveals the differential selectivity of rural and urban migrants and also of a rural area near an urban center with one more removed from urban influence.

In general migrants to newly settled rural areas draw from nearby rural areas although many had originated from more distant areas. This rural-to-rural finding supports the commonly accepted theory formulated by Ravenstein for rural-urban migration--that cities tend to draw from nearby areas leaving vacancies which are filled by migrants from more distant locations.

However, the opening of a new urban center such as the capital city of Brasilia stimulates migration for more distant areas directly to the urban center. A high proportion of the migrants to Brasilia had originated in the northeast, while most of the migrants to the rural county located some distance from Brasilia originated from more nearby areas. Furthermore, the urban center attracts persons from more distant areas than do the rural areas surrounding the city. Some of these came as a part of public agencies and private firms which relocated in the new capital.

A comparison of the respondents' and the respondents' fathers' birthplace reveals relatively little moving during the fathers' generation. Among present migrants, the range of moving during the respondent's lifetime appears to be much greater than that of the respondent's father's early residence history.

Considerable circular movement occurs between rural and urban areas; among the rural Brasilia respondents almost half had had some urban experience.

Early migrants to an area tend to have more resources and tend to settle and remain in an area, while later migrants tend to be less stable. This difference suggests that the early migrants reap the major benefits of the newly settled areas leaving less desirable opportunities for those who come later.

Relatives and friends are the most frequent source of information about the destination. Personal visits are next most commonly mentioned, followed by radio reports, strangers' reports, and newspaper and magazine reports. Rural migrants depend more upon relatives than do urban migrants.

Economic reasons comprise the most frequent "push" as well as "pull" factors for moving. Conflicts or poor relationships with landlords and with other persons were an important reason too, often forcing the rural migrant to the isolated rural area to leave his last place of residence. The condition of schools and medical services was a more frequent reason for moving for those going to Brasilia than for those moving to the isolated rural area.

The general attraction of the new capital as a place of opportunity and a place to begin a "new life" held second place to economic reasons for coming to Brasilia. While largely unanticipated, the climate of Brasilia was the most commonly mentioned favorable aspect of Brasilia. For the rural Brasilia respondent, educational and medical services available in the area were a close second to economic advantages as the things most liked about the new location.

The major complaints of rural and urban migrants to Brasilia are the transportation problem and lack of water and sewage in some areas, difficulties furthered by the physical layout of the city and its satellites. The layout compounds the transportation problem for going to work, shopping, and for other purposes.

While the level of income and living is lower in the rural area around Brasilia, more of the rural respondents felt they had benefitted from their move than did the urban respondents, although differences were not great. Most migrants to rural Brasilia felt they were better off in all respects than they were in the place of previous residence. However, more of the migrants to the rural area distant from Brasilia felt they were worse off with respect to education and health facilities than they were previously.

Few (16 percent) of the urban residents in Brasilia would return to agriculture even if given an opportunity to buy their land. Half of this number say they would definitely need technical assistance in order to return to farming.

There is general agreement by both rural and urban respondents in Brasilia that people who work the land are not given much recognition or prestige. However, about half of the urban respondents and nine-tenths of the rural respondents consider farm work "more pleasant" than work in the city. When it comes to the personal qualities of people who work the land, city people degrade the farm worker. Two-thirds of the urban respondents feel that the farmer is less intelligent than the city person and four-fifths think that he has lower moral character. These findings reflect considerable ambiguity in the urban person's feelings about the farmer and rural life.

Aspirations for education and occupations of sons and daughters tend to be much higher for both rural and urban samples in Brasilia than for the more isolated rural sample. Over half of the rural Brasilia respondents wanted university education for their sons while this level was desired by only one-fifth of the isolated rural respondents. Nearness to opportunities for education and employment appear to influence educational and occupational aspirations.