The OSCAR PUBLISHING Services
American Journal of Applied Science and Technology

VOLUME Vol.05 Issue 08 2025
PAGE NO. 60-63
DOI 10.37547/ajast/Volume05Issue08-10

Interaction Of Internal Migration And Environmental Factors: Main Theoretical Approaches

Nurmatova Soxiba Isomiddinovna

Teacher Of Geography And Fundamentals Of Economic Knowledge At Secondary School No. 8 Of Karmana District At Navoi Region, Uzbekistan

Received: 10 June 2025; **Accepted:** 19 July 2025; **Published:** 31 August 2025

Abstract: Internal migration is both shaped by environmental forces and a generator of new environmental pressures. Yet scholarly debates often treat "environmental migration" as a narrow subset of hazard-driven mobility, while treating internal migration more generally as a response to economic incentives and social networks. This article synthesizes classic and contemporary theories to show how environmental factors are embedded throughout internal migration systems. Drawing on push–pull theory, the Harris–Todaro expected wage framework, human-capital and life-course approaches, the New Economics of Labor Migration, social-capital perspectives, political ecology, social-ecological resilience, and spatial equilibrium models, we develop an integrative account of how environmental exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity interact with household decision-making and meso-level network structures, and how these interactions aggregate into regional migration regimes. Methodologically, we ground the analysis in a narrative review of canonical works and recent advances in environmental mobility studies, spatial modeling, and climate-risk research. We argue that environmental variables operate as structural "background" conditions that alter relative prices, risks, and opportunities, refracting through institutions and social networks to shape the scale, direction, timing, and selectivity of internal migration. We also highlight feedbacks: internal migration can relieve or amplify local environmental stress through land-use change, urban congestion, and infrastructure transitions. The article closes with implications for research design and policy, including the need to model endogeneity between environment, livelihoods, and mobility; to integrate fine-scale environmental data with longitudinal microdata; and to treat migration not only as a symptom of environmental stress but also as a potential component of adaptation strategies.

Keywords: Internal migration; environmental factors; push–pull; Harris–Todaro; social-ecological resilience; political ecology; adaptation; spatial equilibrium.

INTRODUCTION

Internal migration—movements of people within national borders—has long been explained with economic and demographic theories that emphasize wage differentials, employment prospects, household strategies, and social networks. Environmental forces are often acknowledged but relegated to special cases such as disaster displacement or drought-related out-migration. This partitioning obscures the ways in which environmental conditions pervade the determinants of migration and how migration itself transforms local environments. The interaction is bidirectional: climatic variability, land degradation, water scarcity, heat stress, and ecological shocks alter the relative attractiveness of origin and destination areas, while migration reorganizes labor, capital, and consumption in ways that drive new land-use patterns, pollution loads, and resource demands.

The central question addressed here is theoretical: how should we conceptualize the interaction of internal migration and environmental factors across scales and time? Rather than proposing a single new paradigm, the article synthesizes established frameworks—the push–pull model, expected wage theory, human-capital and life-course perspectives, the New Economics of Labor Migration (NELM), social-capital approaches, political ecology, social-ecological resilience, and spatial equilibrium models—to show how each illuminates a facet of the environment–migration nexus. By integrating these

perspectives, we can move beyond dichotomies that oppose "economic" and "environmental" migration and instead analyze how environmental variables enter the opportunity structures, risk calculations, and institutional contexts that shape mobility decisions. The argument is relevant for countries at multiple development stages, where urbanization, agricultural transformation, and climate risk converge to produce complex mobility patterns.

The study employs a structured narrative review. Canonical texts in migration theory were first mapped to identify key mechanisms: differential expected earnings and employment probabilities; household risk diversification and intertemporal optimization; human-capital investment and selection; network-mediated costs; and spatial equilibrium. Contemporary strands in environmental mobility—climate-risk analytics, resilience thinking, political ecology, and social vulnerability—were then reviewed to identify how environmental exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity interact with those mechanisms. Sources include peer-reviewed journal articles and monographs in demography, economics, geography, and environmental social science, as well as major assessments and reports that formalize concepts used by practitioners. Selection prioritized frameworks with explicit mechanisms linking environment to migration decisions or outcomes and studies that clarify feedbacks from migration to environmental change.

To keep the analysis coherent and reproducible, the synthesis proceeds in two stages. First, each theoretical tradition is revisited with an explicit environmental "hook," asking where environmental variables enter the mechanism and how they alter predictions about scale, direction, selectivity, and timing of internal migration. Second, insights are woven into an integrative conceptual model that links micro-level decision-making to meso-level networks and institutions and to macro-level spatial equilibria and environmental feedbacks. Although the article is conceptual, it also distills methodological implications for empirical research, emphasizing the identification of causal effects in systems where environment and migration are jointly determined.

Push–pull theory remains a useful heuristic when the "push" and "pull" components are specified as bundles of prices, risks, and amenities. Environmental factors appear as components of both bundles: declining soil moisture, saline intrusion, or rangeland degradation increase the disutility of remaining in place, while green amenities, heat mitigation, and reliable water supply at destinations increase the utility of moving. Importantly, environmental shocks do not simply "push" more people to move; they also change who can move. Severe livelihood losses can reduce liquid assets and creditworthiness, constraining mobility for the poorest households even as the desire to move rises. Thus, the relationship between environmental stress and migration is frequently non-linear and moderated by access to finance, network support, and information.

In the Harris–Todaro formulation, internal migration responds to the difference in expected incomes, defined by wages and the probability of obtaining employment. Environmental conditions alter both terms. Rural droughts depress agricultural productivity and farm wages while simultaneously increasing variance in income streams, making the urban option comparatively attractive even when formal sector unemployment is high. Conversely, environmental hazards in cities—flood risk in informal settlements, heat stress amplified by urban heat islands, or air pollution—reduce the net expected utility of urban destinations and can slow migration or redirect it toward secondary towns with lower risk. When environmental risk is modeled explicitly, the migration decision becomes a choice over expected utility under uncertainty, in which risk-averse households value income stability and safety infrastructure as much as wage levels. Insurance availability, disaster risk management, and climate-resilient infrastructure thus shift migration equilibria by changing the risk parameters embedded in the expected wage calculus.

Human-capital theory explains why migration is selective: individuals and households compare the discounted present value of expected benefits to the costs of moving, which include information acquisition, foregone earnings, and psychological costs. Environmental degradation interacts with selection by changing the return to specific skills. When agriculture becomes riskier, returns to agronomic skills fall relative to returns to urban service or construction skills, tipping the calculus for younger, better-educated cohorts. Life-course timing matters: students and early-career workers have lower switching costs and higher potential payoffs from reallocation to safer or more productive locations. Environmental risk can also precipitate earlier transitions—schooling migration to safer towns, for example—which cumulate into structural shifts in regional skill distributions.

The New Economics of Labor Migration reframes migration as a household strategy to diversify risk and overcome missing markets in insurance and credit. Environmental volatility makes this perspective particularly powerful. Households facing crop failure

risk may send a member to a low-covariance labor market to stabilize income via remittances. In such cases, migration is not a failure of adaptation but part of it. Remittances finance adaptive investments at origin—water-saving irrigation, drought-resistant seeds, home elevation, or livelihood diversification—potentially reducing long-run pressure to move. Yet the same remittances can increase consumption and land-use intensity, with consequences for water demand and waste generation. Whether migration is adaptive or maladaptive depends on the portfolio of investments it enables and the institutional context governing resource use.

Networks lower the cost and uncertainty of moving by providing information, job referrals, and temporary housing. Environmental stress often triggers network activation and expansion, which can generate migration cascades. At the same time, network-dense inflows into particular neighborhoods may concentrate environmental exposure if those areas are hazard-prone, as commonly occurs with floodplains or heat-vulnerable informal settlements. Social capital also shapes community-level adaptive capacity: cohesive communities can coordinate risk reduction, lobby for services, and share resources, attenuating the need to move or supporting circular mobility that spreads risk without permanent exit.

Political ecology situates environmental risk within histories of land tenure, water governance, and infrastructural provision. From this vantage point, environmental "drivers" of migration are mediated by power relations that allocate exposure and protection unevenly. Policies that restrict legal access to secure land or formal housing can trap low-income migrants in environmentally precarious spaces, while industrial siting and extraction regimes can degrade origin environments and precipitate out-migration. Recognizing these institutional filters prevents the ecological fallacy of attributing mobility solely to climate or hazard variables and clarifies why similar environmental shocks produce different mobility outcomes across groups and places.

Resilience thinking contributes a vocabulary of thresholds, feedbacks, and regime shifts. In livelihoods systems, sequences of shocks can push households past tipping points where incremental coping gives way to dislocation. Migration can increase resilience by reallocating labor and enabling remittance-financed adaptation, or it can erode resilience by depleting social capital, undermining local institutions, and accelerating resource extraction through labor shortages that encourage mechanization and expansion. Urban systems exhibit their own thresholds: beyond certain densities, congestion, pollution, and infrastructure overload can degrade environmental quality and public health, feeding back into migration decisions and urban planning challenges.

Spatial equilibrium models explain how households and firms sort across space until differences in wages, rents, and amenities are arbitraged away. Environmental quality is a central amenity. Improvements in air quality, water reliability, and green space are capitalized into housing costs, drawing higher-income households while potentially displacing low-income residents to cheaper, riskier locations. Conversely, deteriorating environmental conditions can reduce local wages, but if mobility is constrained by credit or policy, populations may remain exposed. Accounting for environmental amenities and disamenities in equilibrium models yields testable predictions about urban form, peri-urban expansion, and the rise of secondary cities as environmental refuges or pressure valves.

The interaction is not unidirectional. Internal migration reshapes environments through land-use change at origin and destination, altered demand for energy and water, waste generation, and transportation patterns. Rural out-migration can reduce pressure on marginal lands, enabling regeneration, but it can also trigger land consolidation and mechanization that intensify extraction. Urban in-migration stresses water utilities, sanitation, and transport; without commensurate investment, environmental quality declines, producing new "push" factors. The cumulative effect depends on planning capacity, regulatory enforcement, and the pace at which infrastructure and governance adapt to demographic shifts. Recognizing these feedbacks is essential to avoid attributing environmental degradation to migrants themselves rather than to systemic underprovision of public goods.

Because environment and migration are jointly determined, causal identification is challenging. Exogenous shocks such as rainfall anomalies or sudden-onset disasters can serve as instruments to estimate the effect of environmental variation on mobility, but they must be carefully validated to avoid violating exclusion restrictions. Difference-in-differences and event-study designs help when high-frequency data are available; spatial econometrics captures spillovers across neighboring jurisdictions; and agent-based models can encode behavioral rules and network effects to explore counterfactual policies. Advances in remote sensing provide fine-grained measures of vegetation health, heat exposure, water bodies, and urban expansion, while

administrative registers and mobile-phone-based mobility data offer new windows into internal movements. The most promising designs combine these sources in longitudinal frameworks that track households over time, enabling tests of selection, adaptation, and feedback.

The theoretical synthesis carries pragmatic implications. If environmental variables enter migration decisions via expected income, risk, and amenities, then policies that stabilize rural incomes and reduce exposure—crop insurance, drought-tolerant technologies, water governance—can temper distress mobility and enable voluntary, planned transitions. Urban policies that expand affordable, hazard-safe housing and green infrastructure can maintain the net benefits of migration while limiting environmental externalities. Critically, social-protection schemes and labor intermediation services reduce the credit and information frictions that make environmentally induced mobility regressive and chaotic. Framed appropriately, internal migration can be part of a portfolio of adaptation pathways: seasonal or circular mobility that smooths income, planned relocation from high-risk zones, and skills training that matches workers to emerging low-carbon sectors. Policies should thus be evaluated not only by their effect on migration volumes but by how they reshape the environment–mobility feedbacks toward resilience and equity.

The interaction between internal migration and environmental factors is not a narrow phenomenon confined to disaster displacement or drought-related exodus. It is a pervasive feature of migration systems because environmental conditions co-determine prices, risks, and amenities—the very variables that migration theories treat as fundamental. By reexamining classic frameworks through an environmental lens and incorporating insights from political ecology, resilience science, and spatial equilibrium, this article shows how exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity operate across micro, meso, and macro levels to shape who moves, when, where, and with what consequences for origin and destination environments. Recognizing feedbacks is crucial: migration alters land use and urban metabolism, which in turn modify environmental conditions and future mobility. For research, the agenda is to embed high-resolution environmental data and robust identification strategies into longitudinal analyses of mobility and livelihoods. For policy, the imperative is to design institutions that reduce involuntary exposure, expand safe and affordable mobility options, and align infrastructure and environmental governance with demographic realities. When treated as a component of adaptation rather than merely a symptom of stress, internal migration can become a lever for managing environmental risk and achieving more resilient, equitable development.

REFERENCES

Ravenstein E. G. The Laws of Migration // Journal of the Statistical Society of London. 1885. Vol. 48, No. 2. P. 167–235.

Lee E. S. A Theory of Migration // Demography. 1966. Vol. 3, No. 1. P. 47–57.

Harris J. R., Todaro M. P. Migration, Unemployment and Development: A Two-Sector Analysis // American Economic Review. 1970. Vol. 60, No. 1. P. 126–142.

Sjaastad L. A. The Costs and Returns of Human Migration // Journal of Political Economy. 1962. Vol. 70, No. 5, Pt. 2. P. 80–93.

Stark O. The Migration of Labor. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.

Zelinsky W. The Hypothesis of the Mobility Transition // Geographical Review. 1971. Vol. 61, No. 2. P. 219–249.

Black R., Bennett S. R. G., Thomas S. M., Beddington J. R. Climate change: Migration as adaptation // Nature. 2011. Vol. 478, No. 7370. P. 447–449.

Adger W. N. Social capital, collective action, and adaptation to climate change // Economic Geography. 2003. Vol. 79, No. 4. P. 387–404.

Cutter S. L., Boruff B. J., Shirley W. L. Social vulnerability to environmental hazards // Social Science Quarterly. 2003. Vol. 84, No. 2. P. 242–261.

Folke C. Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses // Global Environmental Change. 2006. Vol. 16, No. 3. P. 253–267.

International Organization for Migration. World Migration Report 2020. Geneva: IOM, 2019.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.