

**Headword/Title:**

Brazil, Internal Migration, 1960–2010<sup>1</sup>

**Author details**

**Name:** Ernesto Friedrich de Lima Amaral

**Affiliation:** Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Brazil

**E-mail address:** eflamaral@gmail.com

**Mini-biography (three or four sentences, including affiliation and notable research):**

Professor in the Political Science Department at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Brazil, with a Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Texas at Austin. Work on research related to migration, demographic transition, economic development and evaluation of public policies. Has papers published in the *Population Review*, *Urban Geography* and *Brazilian Journal of Population Studies*.

**Total word count of the main text and the reference section (does not include title, mini-biography, or key terms):** 2,810

Internal migration has been decisive in the process of rapid urbanization that has occurred throughout Brazil in recent decades. Between 1950 and 2000, Brazil's urban population grew from 36 percent to 81 percent of the total population (Table 1). During this period, the country underwent major transformations and became an industrial and urban, rather than an agricultural and rural, society. High levels of migration from the countryside to urban areas and agricultural frontiers occurred. Internal migration flows were heaviest in movements from the Northeastern to the Southeastern states. The usual explanation for this movement references poverty and the lack of job opportunities in the Northeast combined with the concentration of industries in the Southeast, mainly in the state of São Paulo. Migration from the Northeast to the Southeast was characterized by a rural-to-urban migration in the 1960s and 1970s. Lower-class people migrated and still migrate to the Southeast because that area is Brazil's most industrialized region and has numerous job opportunities (Amaral 2008). Demand from major economic centers has caused population redistribution among the different states, agglomerating the majority of the population in urban clusters (Braga and Fazito 2010). An important feature of this process is that areas with more employment opportunities are characterized by more modern industries (the Southeast) and tend to attract the female population from less developed areas (the Northeast). However, migration rates from the Southeast to the Northeast are higher for men than for women. Areas with fewer opportunities for women to enter the labor force attract more male migrants (Amaral 2008; Rogers and Castro 1981).

**>>> Table 1 <<<**

A process of spatial deconcentration has occurred since the 1970s. Internal migration is no longer predominantly a rural-to-urban phenomenon (Amaral 2008; Baeninger 2000; Baeninger and Cunha 2000; Brito, Horta and Amaral 2001; Fazito and Braga 2010). Demographic growth has decreased in the Brazilian regions (Table 2), due to diminishing fertility rates and changes in migration patterns (Brito, Horta and Amaral 2001).

**>>> Table 2 <<<**

Areas that had previously attracted large numbers of people (the Central-West and São Paulo) experienced a decrease in immigration rates in the 1980s (Cunha and Baeninger 2000). Many migrants stopped leaving states that were previously characterized by high emigration rates (Minas Gerais and Paraná); migrants in those states instead moved to areas within their own states. Levels of migration from the Northeast to the Southeast remained high. However, large increases in immigration rates to the Northeast also occurred. These increases featured a considerable return movement to the region. São Paulo's population declined, in contrast with the growth of other metropolitan areas in the country. The migratory flow to the Southeast and

---

<sup>1</sup> Please contact the authors regarding any further use of this working paper. Do not cite without permission. Accepted for publication by "The Encyclopedia of Global Human Migration."

towards the boundary regions (North and Central-West) decreased. Moreover, migratory losses in the Northeast and South have fallen considerably (Table 3).

>>> **Table 3** <<<

With regard to the border areas (the Central-West and the North), the latest migration flows are directed to major municipalities in these regions. We cannot accurately create chronological differentiations between periods, as if one type of migration completely displaced another. It is important to differentiate among types of migration over time, but it is equally important to note that these types of migration occurred concomitantly at different times, and that one type is more visibly prevalent in a given period than in others (Amaral 2002). The interaction between old and new trends in population flows establishes new patterns of internal migration in a country with a multiplicity of contexts (Braga and Fazito 2010). Currently, flows are directed to different locations (suburbs of large cities, medium-sized cities and migratory returns) simultaneously with the retention of old patterns (flows from the Northeast to the Southeast), due to the stability of social networks among migrants (Braga and Fazito 2010; Lima and Braga 2010). Nowadays, the most important flow is the urban-urban migration pattern. Two important aspects of this new pattern are the increasing significance of medium-sized cities and of intra-metropolitan migration. Intra-metropolitan migration occurs between central urban areas and peripheral territories. The upper classes segregate themselves in gated communities separate from the lower classes. Low-income people are concentrated in run-down urban areas. Internal migration has become more complex, with a wide variety of places of origin and destination and a change in the socio-economic characteristics of migrants (Baeninger 2000; Cerrutti and Bertonecello 2003; Cunha and Baeninger 2000; Roberts 1995).

The new migration patterns are characterized by a relative decline in the number of people on the move. The decrease in population flows seems to indicate the disruption of networks between some locations. This process affects the transmission of human capital between different areas, which is important for the development of the country. The cycle of rural exodus has also ended. This exodus was one cause of the overloading of public services and infrastructure, the growth of slums in urban centers, the rise of unemployment and informal labor, and the emptying of rural areas. Current migrants tend to be more qualified than in the past; this characteristic contributes to decentralized development (Braga and Fazito 2010).

Scholars have often hypothesized that migration worked to ease the high fertility rates of Brazil's rural areas. It was an open question whether rural-to-urban migration would decrease as a response to the decline of rural fertility, a decline that became widespread during the 1980s. If the migratory balance, in conjunction with the decline in fertility, had persistently been negative for rural areas, uninhabited areas would have appeared. However, migratory movements appear to have adjusted themselves to the decline of fertility (Table 3). Brazil's spatial distribution appears to be moving quickly towards stabilization. Although rural-to-urban migration has decreased in the last decades, officials continue to face the challenge of implementing public policies that prevent declining rural fertility and migratory movements from creating deserted areas.

Currently, the growth of large metropolitan areas has slowed, and flows have been redirected to medium and non-metropolitan municipalities. In metropolitan areas, a trend towards concentrating the population in peripheral municipalities rather than in urban centers has emerged. Based on demographic and economic indicators, as well as on flows of goods and services, the municipalities of Belém, Belo Horizonte, Brasília, Campinas, Curitiba, Fortaleza, Goiânia, Porto Alegre, Recife, Rio de Janeiro, Salvador, and São Paulo and its surroundings are defined as metropolitan areas (Brito, Horta and Amaral 2001). Table 4 shows the distribution of Brazil's urban population in the context of municipality categories. With respect to non-metropolitan areas, municipalities smaller than 20,000 people maintained about one-quarter of the population in 1970 and one-fifth in 1980. Over time, this proportion declined in favor of larger municipalities, particularly those with populations of between 100,000 and 500,000 inhabitants. As for metropolitan areas, nearly half of the urban population lived in these locations in 1970 and 1980, which represented the peak of urban concentration. In 1970, about 34 percent of the urban population lived in metropolitan centers. Since 1980, urban populations have spread out, leading to a reduction in the relative importance of the metropolitan centers. However, most of the population living in metropolitan areas is still found in municipalities with over 100,000 inhabitants. In 2000, nearly 92 percent of the population of metropolitan areas lived in these municipalities. Despite changes in migration patterns, 41 percent of the urban population

resided in metropolitan areas in 2000, nearly 24 percent in metropolitan centers. That is, in 2000, around 33 million Brazilians lived in one of the 12 municipalities mentioned above.

>>> **Table 4** <<<

We can detect population growth-rate patterns in those areas that state governments define as Metropolitan Regions (Table 5). Between 1970 and 1980, most of these regions experienced a decrease in their growth rates. Only Curitiba, in the South of Brazil, increased its population growth rate when we compare the period between 1960 and 1970 with the period between 1970 and 1980. The reduction was apparent at the time of the 1991 Census. Furthermore, data from 2000 indicate that Porto Alegre, Recife, Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo Metropolitan Regions all had growth rates below two percent.

>>> **Table 5** <<<

An interesting aspect of the migration streams is that of returning migration. Census data indicate that population flow rates from the Southeast to the Northeast have been increasing over the last few decades. São Paulo still plays a central role in attracting migrants from the Northeastern region. At the same time, important returning flows from the Southeast to the Northeast have been increasing (Amaral 2008; Baeninger 2000). Migration is no longer solely explainable by labor determinants (Jannuzzi 2000). For instance, migration flows caused by returning migrants are more heavily populated by younger age groups, because returning migration involves entire families moving from one region to another. Consequently, more children are involved than other age groups. For instance, the migration pattern from Paraná to Brazilian locations other than São Paulo between 1975–1980 reveals higher rates for the younger age group (10–14) and declining rates for people who are at least 20 years old (Schmertmann 1999). Thus, these different migration patterns are evidence that rates are not only attributable to work-related movements. Patterns of migration by age depend on the regions and time that analysts study, as well as on the reasons for migration. Migration from the Northeastern region to the Southeastern region is composed mainly of people in the age groups between 15–19 and 30–34. This is a typical migration flow that involves people moving in search of job opportunities. In these flows, rates are higher for working-age individuals (Rogers and Castro 1981). In the case of migration from the Southeast to the Northeast, the flow rates of younger people are much higher. This finding is consistent with the argument that this particular migration flow is related to the movements of families. Thus, we find that migratory movements involving those regions have different patterns; the data support the argument that the Southeastern region has more job opportunities for persons of working age, and the Northeastern region is more attractive to people migrating as families (Amaral 2008).

Daily commutes between municipalities still characterize metropolitan areas. A growing body of research addresses this pendulum movement of people commuting daily from their homes to their places of work or study. These population flows provide indicators that reveal urban dynamics and shed light on the integration of municipalities within metropolitan areas. The 2000 Census indicated that a total of 7.4 million people worked or studied outside their residential municipality (IBGE 2003).

Finally, the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics is currently implementing a new and important instrument for gathering demographic, economic, social, and health information on Brazil's population. The Continuous National Household Survey (PNAD *Contínua*) will replace the National Household Survey (PNAD) in the next few years. Among other areas of interest, this new instrument will increase the amount of data on, and our understanding of, internal migration in Brazil.

**References:**

- Amaral, E. F. L., Nascimento, R. R., and Bueno, M. G. (2002) "Síntese da migração em Goiás e no Distrito Federal nas últimas décadas" ["Synthesis of migration in Goiás and in the Federal District in the last decades"]. *Sociedade e Cultura*, 5: 127–136.
- Amaral, E. F. L. (2008) "Improvements of techniques to estimate migration rates: an application with Brazilian censuses data." *Population Review*, 47 (2): 1–24.
- Baeninger, R. (2000) "São Paulo no contexto dos movimentos migratórios interestaduais" ["São Paulo in the context of interstate migratory movements"]. In D. J. Hogan, J. M. P. Cunha, R. Baeninger, and R. L. Carmo (Eds.), *Migração e Ambiente em São Paulo: Aspectos Relevantes da Dinâmica Recente*

- [*Migration and Environment in São Paulo: Relevant Aspects of the Recent Dynamic*]. Campinas, Brazil: Population Studies Center (NEPO), University of Campinas (UNICAMP), pp.127–169.
- Braga, F. G., and Rezende, D. F. A. (2010) “Análise de redes sociais e as conexões territoriais da migração no Brasil: padrões estruturais da migração interna entre 1980 e 2000” [“Analysis of social networks and the territorial connections of migration in Brazil: structural patterns of internal migration between 1980 and 2000”]. Paper presented at the XVII Encontro Nacional de Estudos Populacionais [XVII Brazilian National Meeting of Population Studies], Caxambu, Brazil, September 20 to 24, 2010.
- Brito, F., and Carvalho, J. A. M. (2006) “As migrações internas no Brasil: as novidades sugeridas pelos censos demográficos de 1991 e 2000 e pelas PNADs recentes” [“Internal migration in Brazil: news suggested by 1991–2000 demographic censuses and by recent national household surveys”] Paper presented at the XV Encontro Nacional de Estudos Populacionais [XV Brazilian National Meeting of Population Studies], Caxambu, Brazil, September 18 to 22, 2006.
- Brito, F., Horta, C. J. G., and Amaral, E. F. L. (2001). “The Brazilian recent urbanization and the urban conurbations.” Paper presented at the XXIV General Population Conference of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, Salvador, Brazil, August 18 to 24, 2001.
- Cerrutti, M., and Bertonecello, R. (2003) “Urbanization and Internal Migration Patterns in Latin America.” Paper presented at the Conference on African Migration in Comparative Perspective, Johannesburg, South Africa, June 4 to 7, 2003.
- Cunha, J. M. P., and Baeninger, R. (2000) “A migração nos estados brasileiros no período recente: principais tendências e mudanças” [“Migration in Brazilian states in the recent period: main tendencies and changes”]. In D. J. Hogan, J. M. P. Cunha, R. Baeninger, and R. L. Carmo (Eds.), *Migração e Ambiente em São Paulo: Aspectos Relevantes da Dinâmica Recente* [*Migration and Environment in São Paulo: Relevant Aspects of the Recent Dynamic*]. Campinas, Brazil: Population Studies Center (NEPO), University of Campinas (UNICAMP), pp.17–57.
- IBGE. (2003) *Censo Demográfico 2000: Migração e Deslocamento, Resultados da Amostra* [2000 Demographic Census: Migration and Displacement, Results from the Sample] Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE).
- Jannuzzi, P. M. (2000) “Tasas específicas por motivos y acompañantes de la migración: una contribución a la interpretación y al uso de modelos de patrones etarios de migración” [“Specific rates by reasons and followers of migration: a contribution to the interpretation and to the use of models of age patterns of migration”] *Notas de Población*, 28 (70): 33–85.
- Lima, E. E. C., and Braga, F. G. (2010) “Da rotatividade migratória à baixa migração: uma tipologia dos padrões da mobilidade populacional no Brasil” [“From migratory turnover to low migration: one typology of population mobility patterns in Brazil”]. Paper presented at the XVII Encontro Nacional de Estudos Populacionais [XVII Brazilian National Meeting of Population Studies], Caxambu, Brazil, September 20 to 24, 2010.
- Roberts, B. (1995). *The Making of Citizens*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Rogers, A., and Castro, L. J. (1981) *Model Migration Schedules*. Laxenburg, Austria: International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis.
- Schmertmann, C. P. (1999) “Estimating multistate transition hazards from last-move data.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94 (445): 53–63.

#### **Further readings:**

- Baeninger, R. (Ed.) (2010) *População e Cidades: Subsídios para o Planejamento e para as Políticas Sociais* [*Population and Cities: Subsidies for Planning and Social Policies*]. Campinas, Brazil: Population Studies Center (NEPO), University of Campinas (UNICAMP).
- Cunha, J. M. P. (Ed.) (2006) *Novas Metrôpoles Paulistas: População, Vulnerabilidade e Segregação* [*New Metropolis in São Paulo: Population, Vulnerability and Segregation*]. Campinas, Brazil: Population Studies Center (NEPO), University of Campinas (UNICAMP).
- Golgher, A. B, and Marques, D. H. F. (2009) “Diversidad socioeconómica regional de los flujos de migración interna en Brasil” [“Regional socioeconomic diversity of internal migration flows in Brazil”]. *Economía, Sociedad y Territorio*, 9 (31): 681–721.
- Golgher, A. B. (2008) “As cidades e a classe criativa no Brasil: diferenças espaciais na distribuição de indivíduos qualificados nos municípios brasileiros” [“Cities and the creative class in Brazil: spatial differences in the distribution of qualified individuals in Brazilian municipalities”]. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos de População*, 25 (1): 109–129.

- Golgher, A. B., Rosa, C. H., and Araújo-Júnior, A. F. (2008) “Determinants of migration in Brazil: regional polarization and poverty traps.” *Papeles de Población*, 56: 135–171.
- Hogan, D. J. (Ed.) (2001) *Population Change in Brazil: Contemporary Perspectives*. Campinas, Brazil: Population Studies Center (NEPO), University of Campinas (UNICAMP).
- Matos, R. E. S. (2005) “Periferias de grandes cidades e movimentos populacionais” [“Peripheries in big cities and population movements”]. *Cadernos Metrópole*, 13: 71–105.
- Matos, R. E. S. (Ed.) (2005) *Espacialidades em Rede: População, Urbanização e Migração no Brasil Contemporâneo* [*Spatiality in Network: Population, Urbanization and Migration in the Contemporary Brazil*]. Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Editora Com Arte.
- Matos, R. E. S., and Soares, W. (Eds.) (2009) *Desigualdades, Redes e Espacialidades Emergentes no Brasil* [*Inequalities, Networks and Emerging Spatiality in Brazil*]. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Garamond.
- Rigotti, J. I. R. (2006) “Geografia dos fluxos populacionais segundo níveis de escolaridade dos migrantes” [“Geography of population flows by levels of schooling of migrants”]. *Estudos Avançados*, 20 (57): 237–254.
- Rigotti, J. I. R. (2010) “Información de los censos demográficos del Brasil sobre migraciones internas: críticas y sugerencias para el análisis” [“Information of Brazilian demographic censuses about internal migrations: criticisms and suggestions for analysis”]. *Notas de Población*, 88: 219–244.

**Table 1. Distribution of the Population by Residential Situation and Region, Brazil, 1950–2010.**

	<b>1950</b>	<b>1960</b>	<b>1970</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Residential situation</b>							
Urban	36.16	45.08	55.98	67.70	75.47	81.23	*
Rural	63.84	54.92	44.02	32.30	24.53	18.77	*
<b>Region</b>							
North	3.94	4.13	4.43	5.59	6.98	7.60	8.32
Northeast	34.60	31.59	30.34	29.24	28.91	28.12	27.84
Southeast	43.41	43.76	42.68	43.40	42.65	42.63	42.10
South	15.09	16.75	17.65	16.00	15.05	14.79	14.37
Central-West	2.95	3.77	4.90	5.78	6.41	6.85	7.37
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>51,944,397</b>	<b>70,992,343</b>	<b>94,508,583</b>	<b>121,150,573</b>	<b>146,917,459</b>	<b>169,590,693</b>	<b>190,632,694</b>

\* These data were not yet available when this essay was completed.

Source: Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), 1950–2010 Demographic Censuses (<http://serieestatisticas.ibge.gov.br>).

**Table 2. Population Growth Rates by Residential Situation and Region, Brazil, 1950–2010.**

	<b>1950/1960</b>	<b>1960/1970</b>	<b>1970/1980</b>	<b>1980/1991</b>	<b>1991/2000</b>	<b>2000/2010</b>
<b>Residential situation</b>						
Urban	5.15	5.22	4.44	2.97	2.47	*
Rural	1.55	0.57	-0.62	-0.67	-1.31	*
<b>Region</b>						
North	3.34	3.47	3.70	3.85	2.86	2.09
Northeast	2.08	2.40	2.16	1.83	1.31	1.07
Southeast	4.07	3.45	2.48	1.38	1.43	0.87
South	3.06	2.67	2.00	1.77	1.62	1.05
Central-West	5.36	5.60	4.05	3.01	2.39	1.90
<b>Brazil</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>1.93</b>	<b>1.64</b>	<b>1.17</b>

\* These data were not yet available when this essay was completed.

Source: Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), 1950–2010 Demographic Censuses (<http://serieestatisticas.ibge.gov.br>).

**Table 3. Net Migration by Region, Brazil, 1960–2004.**

<b>Region</b>	<b>1960/1970*</b>	<b>1970/1980*</b>	<b>1986/1991**</b>	<b>1986/1991***</b>	<b>1995/2000***</b>	<b>1999/2004***</b>
North	-51,063	585,397	131,218	131,323	78,584	63,741
Northeast	-1,754,761	-2,402,244	-876,534	-876,545	-788,146	-164,139
Southeast	815,884	2,262,364	640,138	640,132	482,388	-215,308
South	371,175	-1,613,377	-185,391	-185,369	-19,172	34,586
Central-West	746,611	638,281	290,569	290,559	246,346	203,568

Source: \*Cunha and Baeninger (2000), using information on place of previous residence (last-move data), based on 1970–1980 Demographic Censuses; \*\*Cunha and Baeninger (2000), using information on place of residence five years in the past, based on 1991 Demographic Census; \*\*\*Brito and Carvalho (2006), using information on place of residence five years in the past, based on 1991–2000 Demographic Censuses and 2004 National Household Survey (PNAD).

**Table 4. Distribution of the Urban Population by Municipality Category, Brazil, 1970–2000.**

<b>Municipality Category</b>	<b>1970</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>2000</b>
<b>Non-Metropolitan Areas</b>				
< 20,000 inhabitants	25.82	20.92	19.07	18.57
20,000 – 49,999	9.48	9.91	11.29	10.60
50,000 – 99,999	5.77	7.40	8.07	8.28
100,000 – 499,999	10.29	14.84	16.41	17.31
500,000 or more	0.00	0.00	2.23	4.25
<b>Total</b>	<b>51.36</b>	<b>53.07</b>	<b>57.07</b>	<b>59.02</b>
<b>Metropolitan Areas</b>				
< 20,000 inhabitants	1.09	0.43	0.27	0.28
20,000 – 49,999	2.56	1.49	1.15	0.87
50,000 – 99,999	2.03	3.10	2.16	2.30
100,000 – 499,999	7.47	6.62	8.02	8.78
500,000 or more	1.40	4.19	4.76	4.91
Metropolitan center	34.09	31.11	26.56	23.83
<b>Total</b>	<b>48.64</b>	<b>46.93</b>	<b>42.93</b>	<b>40.98</b>

Source: Brito, Horta and Amaral (2001), based on 1970–2000 Demographic Censuses.

**Table 5. Population Growth Rates by Metropolitan Region, Brazil, 1960–2000.**

<b>Metropolitan Region</b>	<b>1960/1970</b>	<b>1970/1980</b>	<b>1980/1991</b>	<b>1991/2000</b>
Belém	4.85	4.30	2.70	2.82
Belo Horizonte	6.25	4.67	2.50	2.40
Curitiba	5.04	5.80	3.00	3.17
Fortaleza	4.87	4.30	3.40	2.43
Porto Alegre	4.19	3.84	2.60	1.70
Recife	3.93	2.73	1.90	1.50
Rio de Janeiro	3.62	2.45	1.00	1.15
Salvador	4.77	4.39	3.20	2.15
São Paulo	5.53	4.45	1.90	1.63

Source: Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), 1960–2000 Demographic Censuses (<http://serieestatisticas.ibge.gov.br>).